

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, with his great sincerity, can be answered, I think, by stating that before a man ever gets to the Senate he is passed upon by the electorate of his State which always includes a great many people of discriminating thought, intuition, and evaluation. The battle is fought out on the firing line and between the parties. The people of the State pass upon the facts and they pass upon the man. The people judge all the facts relating to the man and the problems he will face.

There is a refining and filling-out process that has been going on in our country for almost 200 years. That has been a major part of the committee's thinking on disclosure.

A candidate is examined, exposed, and picked to pieces to a considerable extent. Many of the people know the man personally, where he was reared, what his habits are, what property he holds, and what his faults are.

The people pass on all of those factors. They pass upon the man, his moral character, and fiber. They know what he will do under pressure. They know what he will do under coercion. They know what he will do under political persuasion. The people have a good idea as to that when they deliberately select him to represent them in the Senate.

It seems to me that before the man gets here, if we are to assume that he is unworthy, that he cannot be trusted fully, or that the man is going to be wrong in his approach to problems or wrong in his contacts, and we say to him: "No; we will not let you be a Member of the Senate; we will not let you take your oath and do what you have been selected to do until we strip you in public, so to speak, and expose everything in the world about you," I do not think such action is in keeping with the tradition of the Senate.

And when we adopt that rule, if we ever do, then I think something big and fine will have gone out of this body, and the Senate will become more ordinary than it should be.

We should appeal to the very best that there is in a man. I think that any other approach would have a degrading effect on the man and on this institution. I think it would express a distrust of the people themselves. We did not agree to do that. However, we did adopt the best

rule we could, a rule that would protect that man in such privacy as we thought he was entitled to and at the same time require him to make a report readily acceptable to the Senate at all times, filed in advance, some of it under oath, including the income tax returns. That is there as a protection and a safeguard to him. However, at the same time, we have the written record, so if there are any allegations as to irregularities or even a strong suspicion of wrongful conduct that might be deemed worthy of investigation, the Senate itself, through its processes, could look into that record, made perhaps 2 or 3 years earlier. But it would be in writing. It might contain certain supplemental matters. The facts, or the substance of the facts, would be available and could be checked into. However, they would not be used, would not be exposed, or would not be given out against him until he had had a chance to be heard and to refute the facts in closed session. That is the American system. That is the protection that we afford.

If wrongdoing were shown, it would be exposed, of course, according to the general methods that constitute due process of law under our system—a chance to be heard and an opportunity to call witnesses.

That is the case. But on top of all that, we extracted all those financial items that go with public life, go with official conduct or official expenditures or semi-official expenditures, such as the cost of campaigns, the cost of dealing with constituents in a semiofficial capacity, and said that that information must be published every year. In that way, only the items that are private, that are not fully disclosed, are fixed where they can be readily disclosed for cause.

The committee believes that that is the soundest rule, that it is the American rule. I believe that on a test of the amendment, the selection we have made will prove to be the will of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor. The Senate will not have any votes this afternoon. As a practical matter, I know it will not. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Mississippi for waiting for me. I was delayed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 635 AND 636

Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments, and I ask that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. STENNIS. Another amendment is pending. Does the Senator wish to have these amendments read?

Mr. DODD. I do not insist on their being read. If they are printed, they will be available in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator requests that the amendments be printed.

What is the will of the Senate?

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 19, 1968:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, FR1687 (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of general, under the provisions of section 6066, title 10 of the United States Code.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 19, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Wilbur N. Daniel, Antioch Missionary Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths.—Proverbs 3: 6.

Almighty and allwise God, Thou who hath revealed Thyself as a strength to sustain us and a light to lead us, may this day be rich in the realization of Thy nearness.

Give us the faith to believe that it is possible for us to live victoriously even in the midst of dangerous opportunity that we call crisis.

Grant to us a faith which will make us victorious over all the dark and disquieting moods which so frequently beset and baffle us.

Help us to interpret our longings and labors for universal peace; not as an idle dream, but as a glorious divine inspiration from Thee.

We pray that Thou wilt teach us and show us how we may bring about a closer fellowship and a better understanding between all members of the human family. O God, may we see and understand just how much we have in common and how much we need each

other. May we be guided by Thy will as we work together and minister to one another's welfare, peace, and happiness.

Hear us, O God, in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE REVEREND WILBUR N. DANIEL

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay my respects to one of the outstanding clergymen of America. Today we have the Reverend Wilbur N. Daniel, of the Antioch Missionary Baptist Church of Chicago, Ill., to give the invocation. He is the spiritual leader of a congregation made up of over 4,000 people which necessitates the services of over 17 assistants to aid him in administering the spiritual needs of his people.

Reverend Daniel is one of the outstanding men in Chicago in the civic and community life as well as the spiritual. He has been very active fighting for better housing and especially for the housing for the aged. At the present time, he is the director of a \$13 million housing project.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it has been a great pleasure to have a man of this character give the prayer today, and I want to join my colleagues in extending our thanks and appreciation for his participation in the session today.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE NOBLE J. JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sad notice that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late Representative, Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana. Many of you will remember Congressman Johnson who last served in the House as a Member of the 80th Congress.

As a young man I was a constituent of Mr. Johnson. Later, I had the honor of counting Congressman Johnson, his wife Mercy, and daughter Miriam among my Seventh District constituents. In fact, he accompanied me to the floor of the House last January when I was sworn in. Those of us who knew Congressman Johnson had come to recognize and respect his dedication to public service and sincere friendship.

First elected to the 69th Congress in 1924, Congressman Johnson served eight terms from the old Fifth and Sixth Congressional Districts of Indiana. In 1948, President Truman appointed him judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. President Eisenhower elevated him to chief judge of that court in 1956.

Our colleague was a fine gentleman and Representative of the Hoosier State he loved so dearly. He will be remembered for his many constructive contributions during more than 40 years of service to his community, State, and Nation. Mrs. Myers and I extend to Mrs. Johnson and family our deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana, the Republican Party,

and the people of the United States have suffered a great loss.

A former Member of this body and one of the most active public officials our State has ever known has died.

The Honorable Noble Jacob Johnson, who emerged from Indiana's Wabash Valley to become one of the country's most noted statesmen, passed away last weekend.

Noble was more than just a Congressman; to the people of western Indiana he was the Government. When they needed him he was there and he gave far more than was asked of him.

Noble was a way of life. He served in the 69th, 70th, and 71st Congresses. He was defeated for a seat in the 72d Congress and suffered another defeat for a spot in the 75th Congress.

But Noble came back. And he came back strong. He was elected to the 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

Noble was born in Terre Haute, Ind., on August 23, 1887. He attended grade and high schools in Terre Haute and later studied law.

He was deputy prosecutor for the 43d Judicial Circuit of Indiana in 1917 and 1918. He was elected prosecuting attorney for the circuit and served from 1921 to 1925.

In 1925 he began his career in Congress. He served from 1925 to 1931 and from 1939 to 1948. In 1948 he resigned to become judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

With the passing of Noble Johnson I have lost a dear friend and a person who has helped me throughout the years. But most important, he was a friend to all of us. He made many visits with several of us during the last few years and we have always found him to have wise advice and helpful suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my colleagues here today share with me the sadness that is in my heart due to the passing of this great man.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing sympathy to the family of Noble Johnson. He was a dedicated public servant who served his State and his Nation in a variety of capacities and always with distinction. It can truly be said that he was an outstanding public servant of his beloved country.

Mrs. Adair joins me in extending sympathy to the family.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, all who knew him were saddened by the recent death of the Honorable Noble J. Johnson, retired chief judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

In his long and distinguished career, Judge Johnson served two terms as prosecuting attorney of the 43d Indiana judicial circuit, and was elected as a Representative in the U.S. Congress for eight terms, from the 69th through the 80th Congress.

He resigned from the 80th Congress to become a judge on the court in 1948, and was elevated to chief judge in 1956, by President Eisenhower. Retiring from the

court in 1956, he had resided in Washington, D.C., until his death.

He was one of the Hoosier State's great statesmen and jurists, and Indiana is proud to have contributed so noble a son to the service of his country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was saddened to learn of the passing of my former colleague and fellow Hoosier, Noble J. Johnson.

He came to the Congress a decade before I did, and then, after an absence of 8 years, returned to our ranks on this side of the aisle.

Needless to say, we in the minority welcomed him as a legislator of experience and knowhow.

It was my privilege to serve with this distinguished son of Indiana through five terms, during which I came to appreciate Noble Johnson as a conscientious, hardworking Member of this body.

In recognition of his earlier judicial background and his fine record in the Congress, Noble Johnson was appointed to the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals upon his resignation from the Congress. A further mark of recognition of his substantial talents was his elevation to chief judge of the court.

To me, Noble Johnson was a considerate, helpful friend, as I hope I was to him.

He was, in all respects, a "gentleman from Indiana" and I offer my most sincere sympathies to Mrs. Johnson and the family.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of Judge Johnson at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUSTERITY IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard the President use a new word in the lexicon of his Great Society—"austerity." He said we had to tighten our belts, make sacrifices, and adopt a sound fiscal policy.

It would be heartening if we could believe the President is seriously considering a sizable cutback of Federal expenditures. Unfortunately, behind L. B. J.'s ringing words and the Churchillian mood lies the Great Society spending machine.

As long as there are millions for planting posies along the highways and thousands for studying the social life of the blackbird—and as long as the poverty war keeps padding its payroll while pro-

viding less real help for the poor—I say the budget is overstuffed.

The President talks of cutting \$3 to \$4 billion off his budget, making it appear that this is a major sacrifice—roughly equivalent to losing an arm or a leg, but \$4 billion off \$186 billion is a mere drop in the bucket.

L. B. J.'s oratory in his state of austerity address provides good newspaper copy, but actions speak louder than words and up to this point the President has asked that all the sacrifices be made by the people instead of taking a leading role himself in trimming the sails of his Great Society programs.

RIGHT OF AMERICAN CITIZEN TO OWN AND HOLD GOLD

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is time to take a second step so far as gold is concerned and give the American citizen the right to own and hold gold.

The American citizen is the only person in the world outside of the Soviet Union who is denied the right to buy, hold, or sell gold at will.

The first step in this direction was taken Sunday by representatives of the international gold pool when they freed gold commercially to seek its price level on the gold market of the world. Citizens of every other country in the free world are buying gold on the open market. The only citizens in the United States permitted to buy gold are those holding a commercial license to purchase, such as jewelers, dentists, and other gold manufacturers. But so far as the American citizen is concerned, he is still held in the same category as a citizen of the Soviet Union.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to give the American citizen the right to buy, hold, or sell gold on an American market the same as the other markets of the free world.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4386) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ARTHUR JEROME OLINGER, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 155) for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor,

by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

CHESTER E. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 233) for the relief of Chester E. Davis.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOHN W. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1580) for the relief of John W. Rogers.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DWAYNE C. COX AND WILLIAM D. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

E. L. TOWNLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11381) for the relief of E. L. Townley.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH M. HEPWORTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12119) for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ROCHESTER IRON & METAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7210) for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recom-

mitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JE-IL BRICK CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4058) for the relief of the JE-IL Brick Co.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CHARLES BERNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) for the relief of Charles Bernstein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS and Mr. HALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommended to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1040) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH W. HARRIS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 991) to refer the bill (H.R. 14109) entitled "A bill for the relief of Joseph W. Harris," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER, CONCORD, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2282) for the relief of certain employees of the Naval Weapons Center, Concord, Calif.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AT FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10327) for the relief of Louis J. Falardeau, Irva G. Franger, Betty Klemcke, Wineta L. Welburn, and Emma L. McNeil, all individuals employed by the Department of the Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PEDRO ANTONIO JULIO SANCHEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 126) for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

KELLEY MICHELLE AUERBACH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2318) for the relief of Kelley Michelle Auerbach.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 2318

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kelley Michelle Auerbach may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mrs. Kay J. Auerbach, a citizen of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL L. MARGARET, AND JOSEPHINE KIRSTEATTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 909) for the relief of Paul L., Margaret, and Josephine Kirsteatter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

JOHN ALLUNARIO

The Clerk called the bill (L.R. 12073), for the relief of John Allunario.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12073

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Allunario, Bloomington, New Jersey, a sum which shall be certified to the Secretary by the Postmaster General as sufficient to cover the payment, at the rate of compensation then applicable, to the said John Allunario for thirty-eight hours of annual leave credit for the leave years 1964 and 1965 which he did not receive because of administrative error and which was subsequently forfeited by law. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by

any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike "thirty-eight" and insert "fifty-nine".

On page 1, line 10, strike "1964 and 1965" and insert "1962 and 1963".

On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

SUBSTITUTE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHMORE

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute committee amendment offered by Mr. ASHMORE: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the annual leave account of John Allunario, a postal employee of Bloomington, New Jersey, there shall be added a separate account of fifty-nine hours of annual leave, in full settlement of all claims of the said John Allunario against the United States for compensation for the loss of such leave which was earned by him in the period January 1, 1962 through December 31, 1963, inclusive, while he was employed by the United States Post Office Department, and which, through administrative error, was not credited to his leave account.

"Sec. 2. Section 203(c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (65 Stat. 680, 67 Stat. 137; 5 U.S.C. 2062(c)), shall not apply with respect to the leave granted by this Act, and such leave likewise shall not affect the use or accumulation, pursuant to applicable law, of other annual leave earned by the said John Allunario. None of the leave granted by this Act shall be settled by means of a cash payment in the event such leave or part thereof remains unused at the time the said John Allunario is separated by death or otherwise from the Federal service."

The substitute committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Ashley | Hagan | Roybal |
| Baring | Halleck | St. Onge |
| Blackburn | Holland | Selden |
| Boggs | King, Calif. | Shriver |
| Burton, Utah | Landrum | Skubitz |
| Conyers | McEwen | Stubblefield |
| Cowger | Miller, Calif. | Teague, Calif. |
| Davis, Ga. | Moorhead | Teague, Tex. |
| Dent | Mosher | Tuck |
| Derwinski | Purcell | Tunney |
| Diggs | Resnick | Watts |
| Edwards, Calif. | Roth | Wylie |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 15224, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1095) providing for consideration of H.R. 15224, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1095

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15224) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1095 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15224 to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

H.R. 15224 authorizes an appropriation of \$136 million. Of the total authorization, \$67,904,000 is for procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels. The sum of \$14,636,000 is authorized for procurement of nine medium-range helicopters.

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, \$47,660,000 is authorized.

Funds are authorized in the amount of \$5,800,000 for payment to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of the navigable waters of the United States.

Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities as may be necessary, where there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near a Coast Guard installation, may not exceed the average authorized for the Department of Defense.

The duties of the Coast Guard are ever broadening. They have done a magnificent job for us here and are presently rendering a great service in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1095 in order that H.R. 15224 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

As the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has stated, House Resolution 1095 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 15224, Coast Guard authorization.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1969 for the Coast Guard's needs in ships, planes, and shore facilities.

The bill as introduced called for authorizations totaling \$107,000,000, with only one high-endurance cutter included. The committee believes that two more should be constructed in fiscal year 1969, as 23 of the Coast Guard's 33 cutters are seriously over-aged.

The bill also provides for an oceanographic cutter for scientific research, a coastal buoy tender for use in Chesapeake Bay, nine medium-range recovery aircraft, and improvements at numerous shore facilities, including such items as operational buildings, piers, moorings, and family quarters.

The total authorizations contained in the bill are \$136,000,000, of which \$67,904,000 is for vessel procurement, \$14,636,000 for aircraft, and \$47,660,000 for shore facility construction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be adopted, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 15224—to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15224, with Mr. GILBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, every citizen of the United States should be aware of the valuable service rendered by the Coast Guard. There are few people in the country that have not been benefited by its service at some time during the years.

Its helicopters and men are present at disasters and floods throughout the country. It is participating in the war in Vietnam. It renders valuable but unseen service to our Atlantic and Pacific air travelers. It maintains an ice patrol to protect our shipping against another disaster such as the one which befell the *Titanic*, and most importantly, it safeguards our shipping and small boat population. On Friday of this week, it will start the annual ice patrol to discover and warn shipping of icebergs that might cause damage to vessels.

Only recently, on February 29 of this year, its vessels in Vietnam added to the glorious tradition of the service by preventing delivery of hundreds of tons of war materials to the Vietcong. In one engagement on that day, the Coast Guard cutter *Winona*, assisted by an 82-foot Coast Guard patrol boat, destroyed an enemy trawler loaded with ammunition. On the same day, the *Androskoggin*, with two small patrol boats and small Navy boats, drove another trawler ashore where its crew destroyed it. A third was turned back by the cutter *Minnetonka*. This series of engagements have been hailed as the largest naval victory of the Far East war. Shortly thereafter, the service was called upon to minimize the effects of the breaking in two of an oil laden tanker in San Juan Harbor, P.R.

In another activity during the same period, it attempted unsuccessfully the rescue of four Cuban defectors off the Virginia coast.

In addition to these activities, it performs its daily but chiefly unsung services to the 8 million small boat operators of the country. In order to perform services it requires equipment. The greatest part of its fleet of large cutters of the type presently engaged in Vietnam are over-age and require replacement. Because of the conflicting needs of various segments of the country, it has been impossible to replace these as rapidly as the needs of the service dictate.

The bill as presented to the committee provided for replacement of but one of these vessels, and the committee, recognizing the need of the service for greater updating in this category, increased the authorization to three such vessels.

As an illustration of the situation in

which the Coast Guard finds itself, six of the earlier built vessels constructed in 1936 are scheduled for upgrading to permit their operation for a decade or two more.

In the same category are improvements scheduled for smaller vessels, notably buoy tenders, where changes are to be made to increase their habitability. Generally, these vessels are engaged in the unglamorous service of looking after aids to navigation in our nearby waters, and service on them is far from comfortable. In order to permit their operation sometime in the future, it is proposed to make changes that will make them more attractive to their crews, thus assuring higher morale with the corresponding increase in enlistment rates.

Our icebreaker fleet of eight vessels, with one exception, dates back to the early forties, and by reason of increased functions is operating with substantially increased crews. Three of these vessels still have the 1940 quarters, and money is provided to enlarge crew spaces and to provide for greater comfort for the men necessarily serving aboard them.

Other vessels to be constructed include a buoy tender for the Chesapeake, which will replace two old ones and permit greater economies in the service rendered in that area.

In addition, Coast Guard will assume the responsibility for aids to navigation in the remainder of the lower Mississippi, which requires a vessel and supporting shore facilities.

In the aircraft field, nine helicopters are provided which will replace other machines that are overage. Many of the smaller Coast Guard stations are over 50 years old, and efforts are made annually to replace a small number of these.

In addition, training facilities are maintained at Yorktown, Va., Cape May, N.J., and Alameda, Calif. Certain of these facilities require expansion, and World War II buildings still in use demand replacement, which will serve, not only to upgrade training, but will substantially reduce maintenance.

The base at Governors Island is scheduled for construction of family quarters of 160 units. This item was discussed last year, but was deferred at that time. It represents a substantial contribution to the morale of the men serving in the New York area, since at present they are required to pay high rents and commute considerable distances to the base.

In addition, a long overdue sewage disposal system is to be installed which will serve to reduce to some degree the pollution of New York Harbor.

The remaining item of significance in the bill is for continued work on bridges in Louisiana and Illinois, which constitute serious restrictions to navigation of waterways. This last item is under the Truman-Hobbs Act, which provides for cost sharing with the bridge owners for the removal of navigational obstructions.

The amount sought by the Coast Guard in its bill is virtually the same as last year. The committee added two large cutters at \$14.5 million apiece, because it is convinced of the growing need of vessels of this type.

I feel that an extended defense of these expenditures is not necessary, since all of the Members of this body are familiar with the service rendered by the Coast Guard and should be convinced of the need to provide it with sufficient equipment to do the job that we all know it can do.

I point out that the bill was reported unanimously by the committee, and it is my conviction that the amount sought herein is an absolute minimum to permit the Coast Guard to function properly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Following the chairman's discussion of Coast Guard needs, I do not believe that there is a great deal left to be said. However, I do feel that there are certain points that should be emphasized to illustrate the needs of the Coast Guard.

The bill as submitted to the committee called for the construction of two large vessels; one, a high endurance cutter, and the second, an oceanographic cutter. The committee added two high endurance cutters at \$14.5 million each, a total of \$29 million.

As has been previously called to the attention of this committee, the Coast Guard is woefully behind in its cutter replacement program. At the moment, five of these vessels are serving with great distinction off the coast of Vietnam. Everyone of them is overage, and the committee has been very concerned over their probable remaining useful life in the future. In fact, the Coast Guard has been reduced to seeking funds in this bill for the rehabilitation of six vessels built in 1936, since at the present rate of replacement, it is probable that these vessels will have to operate for more than 10 years in the future. At this time, money has been provided for replacement of 10 vessels and one is actually in operation. Twenty-three await replacement. We feel that the replacement rate is far too low and, in consequence, have added the additional two cutters. We may add that we are fully conscious of the fiscal problems confronting the country, but we believe that this particular area is one of which we are likely to be pennywise and pound foolish.

With respect to the other items in the bill, they call for a continuing program of various facilities, both in the training area and in shore stations. In general, the buildings to be replaced in the training field are World War II models that have long since been obsolete, and maintenance is excessively high.

With respect to the small shore stations, a similar situation exists. Many of the buildings are well over 50 years in age, and replacement is long since overdue.

The other major items in the bill are for replacement of overage aircraft, and for continuing work on railroad bridges under the Truman-Hobbs Act.

I believe that the bill merits your favorable consideration and I do not anticipate any great controversy over its provisions. The record of the Coast Guard is such that it has the respect of virtually every Member of the House. Its reputation for modesty in its demands

is such that relatively little time will be needed to present the merits of its claims.

I, as chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, and all of the members of the committee, believe that the claims of the Coast Guard to your favorable action need no extended discussion by me. You are all aware of the value of the Coast Guard to every one of us. In the interests of our safety, we must see that it has the needed equipment to perform its many functions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and concur wholeheartedly in what the chairman has said.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues on our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries who have urged passage of the bill, H.R. 15224.

There is little need for me to enlarge upon what already has been said concerning the provisions of this legislation. Briefly, as originally introduced pursuant to Executive Communication No. 1479, H.R. 15224 would have authorized \$107 million for acquisitions, construction, and improvements by the Coast Guard. Your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries made but one amendment to this administration request. It increased the authorization by \$29 million to furnish funds for three high-endurance cutters instead of one. Thus the total amount authorized for appropriation by H.R. 15224 has been raised by committee action from \$107 million to \$136 million. The needs of the Coast Guard to meet the ever-expanding demands placed upon it clearly justify this increase.

As our national interests have grown, so too has the role of the Coast Guard. Its duties have been continually expanding to meet ever-changing demands and conditions both at home and abroad. Last year, for example, as a result of its transfer to the Department of Transportation, the Coast Guard acquired an additional responsibility from the Corps of Engineers under the Truman-Hobbs Act for alteration of bridges over navigable waters. This year—in fact, less than 2 weeks ago—the Coast Guard was cited for possible additional duties in the field of marine sciences. In his message of March 8, "To Renew a Nation," the President stated:

This year we can begin development of improved ocean buoys. I urge the Congress to approve my request for \$5 million in the Fiscal 1969 Coast Guard budget for this program.

Although this ocean buoys program is in the Coast Guard's research and development budget request and not in this authorization measure, H.R. 15224, it does represent a new responsibility and an area in which we on the Committee on Merchant Marine can anticipate future authorization requests.

Abroad, the Coast Guard and its personnel still are engaged in the Vietnam conflict. Deployed in the area are five high-endurance cutters, 26 patrol craft, and an electronic long-range, aids-to-navigation system manned by more than 1,350 Coast Guard personnel.

Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard has responded willingly and ably to each of these many demands. Unfortunately, our generosity in placing demands upon this service has not been commensurate with our funding for much-needed new equipment and facilities. Each year we on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have tried to place the needs in line with the demands by appropriate increases in the authorization. Yet each year we have seen authorizing legislation like H.R. 15224 enacted into law only to find the amount drastically reduced in the appropriation process to the low level originally requested by the administration. This occurred in each of the 3 previous fiscal years—1966, 1967, and 1968. I sincerely hope that a similar fate does not lie in wait for the measure now under consideration.

The present fleet of Coast Guard cutters has an average service life of almost 25 years. At the present rate of replacement of one per year, replacement of the remaining 23 cutters reaching obsolescence will not be completed for more than 20 years. We, therefore, face the very distinct possibility of having to keep in service cutters in excess of 40 years of age at this replacement rate. There are limits upon what human endurance can accomplish in overcoming deficiencies in facilities. It is high time that both the administration and the Congress recognize this fact of life.

Before we give the Coast Guard any more duties, let us at least give it the proper tools to accomplish what we now demand of it. H.R. 15224, as amended by your Committee on Merchant Marine, is the first halting step in this direction. I strongly urge all my colleagues in the House to support its passage.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and commend him as well as the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], and especially, Mr. Chairman, do I commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on the Coast Guard, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the minority leader of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been ably stated here today that over a period of years, almost one decade, at least, with which I am personally familiar—and history is replete with this fact, also—that prior to the last decade the Coast Guard in its efforts to obtain the essential tools which are necessary to perform its assigned statutory missions and roles has found that these tools have not been provided.

I think my distinguished friend, the gentleman from the great State of Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], who is also a member of the Committee on Armed Services, will agree with me—and I am so happy to see him here on the floor at this moment—that the Coast Guard

has provided in the South Vietnam war zone 26 of our newest, most recently acquired patrol boats—and they are 82-footers—and that now for over a year we have had off the shores of South Vietnam five of our high-endurance cutters. These, of course, were taken from their essential Coast Guard roles and missions where they are so badly needed in the coastal waters of this country and in their offshore duty stations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the time would come when the Department of Defense would reimburse the Coast Guard for these Coast Guard ships they are using. However, I do not know when that time will come.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the Committee on Appropriations will see fit to recognize the need, the desperate need, of what we have asked for in this authorization bill.

In my judgment, and it is my opinion that this judgment is shared by people outside the Congress of the United States that the cost study which has been made not only by the Coast Guard subcommittee but by its parent committee, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, reflects a more comprehensive knowledge of the needs of the Coast Guard than even the agency itself.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am very hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations will respond to the will of the Congress in its passage of this bill, which passage I believe will be unanimous. It is my further hope that the funds which are essential to the missions and roles of the U.S. Coast Guard will be forthcoming.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENNON. Of course, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend and to thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] for his eloquent and forceful statement in support of the passage of this bill. Further, Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] has a colleague from his great State, and a personal friend of mine, if I may say so, in the personage of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Transportation, the subcommittee which will pass upon the ultimate funding of this authorization. Therefore, I appeal to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] to use his best counsel and advice in consultation with his colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] in bringing about the necessary appropriations for carrying forth the authorizations which are provided for in this bill.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California,

the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in urging passage of the bill, H.R. 15224.

In April of last year during consideration by this body of a similar authorization measure, I stated:

The cumulative slippage to date in the Coast Guard's vessel replacement program amounts to \$161.2 million. In terms of vessels, this means the program is 20 ships behind schedule, half of which are of major types such as high and medium endurance cutters and icebreakers needed by the Coast Guard to properly carry out its duties.

This statement was based upon the Coast Guard's so-called cutter plan of 1962 and was correct in that context.

Implementation of this 1962 plan would have required an average annual funding level of approximately \$100 million for the period fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1974. The first 3 fiscal years of the plan's implementation—fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1967—however, resulted in total appropriations for the cutter plan which were less than 60 percent of requirements. Because of this and in recognition of changing vessel requirements, the Coast Guard undertook a reexamination of its vessel replacement program late in 1966.

Mr. Chairman, in its usual conservative fashion, the Coast Guard's revised cutter plan of 1966 reduced the requirements of its 1962 plan by \$19 million. This was accomplished notwithstanding its acquisition of the entire U.S. fleet of polar icebreakers and a general price increase in vessel construction costs. This revised plan called for an annual requirement level of \$117.6 million for replacement and augmentation of Coast Guard cutters from fiscal year 1968 through fiscal year 1974.

Today, this revised Coast Guard vessel replacement program of 1966 is less than 2 years old. Yet it already has a potential cumulative slippage from fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 of 15 vessels, which includes six high-endurance cutters and one icebreaker, and which amounts to about \$144 million.

Accordingly, I most strongly urge my colleagues in the House to pass the bill, H.R. 15224, as amended by your Committee on Merchant Marine, to authorize the appropriation of necessary funds for the construction of three high-endurance cutters by the Coast Guard.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15224.

Last year I served notice to the House that I would oppose the 1969 authorization for the Coast Guard, if in my opinion, its functions relating to boat safety were to be curtailed and more specifically if the Coast Guard station in Racine, Wis., was to be closed down. My position was and still is, that we cannot make economic consideration the sole basis for the safety program of the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard has a multiplicity of

duties to perform and there are indeed few who would suggest that it is not doing a commendable job in fulfilling all of its varied duties. I fully support the authorization of funds included in this bill to complete the helicopter facilities in Chicago, not as a substitute for the Racine station but as a mean of improving the service contributing to the safety of boat users along the shores of Lake Michigan.

With an increase of sizable numbers in the use of boats for recreational purposes, it is necessary to increase the service and to continually update the quality of its present commendable service.

I have been assured that the Coast Guard does not intend to replace the Racine station by the helicopter service from Chicago, but will continue to give the best possible service to the residents of my district through the upgrading and continuing modernization of its service in keeping with its added and increasing responsibilities to an increasing population.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

As a Member of Congress from New York City, I am vitally concerned with the passage of this bill because the Coast Guard conducts a wide range of activities throughout the Port of New York.

Recently there has been a consolidation of Coast Guard units at Governor's Island, which included the transfer of the industrial base from Staten Island and the training center from Groton, Conn. Many of the projects authorized by this bill are vitally needed to accommodate this consolidation.

Probably the most vital projects in this bill are those authorizing the construction of new housing. Last year, of 14,000 married Coast Guard personnel, almost 7,000 were inadequately housed; the problem was especially serious in New York City. We have tried to get better housing in this area for a number of years, but with little success. This year's bill authorizes \$8 million for Coast Guard housing construction, a large part of it slated for Governor's Island, and should be approved in its full amount.

A second project on Governor's Island authorized by this bill is the installation of a sanitary sewage system for all buildings on the island. This system will provide a method of collection, pumping, and transporting waste under Buttermilk Channel to a sewer pipeline owned by the city of New York.

At the present time there are no sewage treatment facilities on the island, and untreated wastes—raw sewage—are discharged directly into New York Harbor. This project, which will cost \$2,500,000, is planned to meet standards established in Federal regulations governing pollution.

The third project slated for the island is the acquisition of a new ferryboat to replace an older boat that is beyond repair. The bill authorizes \$150,000 for the

purchase of the 185-foot ferryboat *Tides* from the city of New York. This new boat, which has a 42-car capacity and diesel-electric propulsion, will be the third ferryboat serving the island.

I urge my colleagues to approve the full authorization for each of these projects, and for the entire bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee and the full committee handling this legislation, I urge the adoption of the bill as it stands, without any amendments, and I stand behind all of the items that appear in the bill.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:

Vessels

For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels, \$38,904,000.

A. Procurement:

- (1) one high-endurance cutter;
- (2) one oceanographic cutter;
- (3) one coastal buoy tender;
- (4) one ferryboat; and
- (5) one river tender and barge.

B. Increasing capability:

- (1) Install generators and air conditioning on five seagoing buoy tenders;
- (2) Improve habitability on two coastal buoy tenders;
- (3) Install air conditioning on one coastal buoy tender; and
- (4) Install balloon tracking radar on two high endurance cutters and modify balloon tracking radar installations on one high endurance cutter.

C. Extension of service life:

- (1) Improve icebreakers; and
- (2) Increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on high endurance cutters.

Aircraft

For procurement of aircraft \$14,636,000.

- (1) nine medium-range helicopters.

Construction

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, \$47,660,000.

- (1) Depot, Greenville, Mississippi: Barracks, messing, and operations building; garage; mooring facilities;
- (2) Moorings, Natchez, Mississippi: Mooring facilities;
- (3) Station, Siuslaw River, Florence, Oregon: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building;
- (4) Station, Hobucken, North Carolina: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; convert existing building to garage and storage building, improve facilities;
- (5) Moorings, Juneau, Alaska: Enlarge existing building to provide additional space for electronic spares shipping and receiving area, office space, and other purposes;
- (6) Station, Point Allerton, Hull, Massachusetts: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; garage and work-

shop building; mooring facilities; helicopter pad;

(7) Station, Grays Harbor, Westpoint, Washington: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building;

(8) Station, Port Aransas, Texas: Repair and replace waterfront facilities;

(9) Loran Station, Cape San Blas, Gulf County, Florida: Barracks building; convert existing building for messing and recreation spaces; enlarge loran building, garage and storage building;

(10) Station, Bayfield, Wisconsin: Barracks, messing, and operations building, pier facilities;

(11) Air Station, Mobile, Alabama: Barracks, BOQ and messing building; training, recreational, and exchange facilities, hangar space conversion;

(12) Station, Cape Charles City, Virginia: Barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities, helicopter pad;

(13) Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities;

(14) Western Long Island Sound Development:

(i) Station, New Haven, Connecticut: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; mooring facilities;

(ii) Station, Eatons Neck, New York: Recondition barracks, operations, and administration building; improve waterfront facilities; and

(iii) Station, Fort Totten, New York: Recondition barracks, messing, administration, and work-storage facilities;

(15) Base, Portsmouth, Virginia: Dredging, bulkheading, site development, utilities;

(16) Station, San Francisco, California: Barracks building, administration building, subsistence building, waterfront facilities;

(17) Yard, Curtis Bay, Maryland: Modify buildings as necessary to provide for consolidation of metal trades;

(18) Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Barracks and messing facilities, waterfront facilities renewal;

(19) Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Dock construction;

(20) Base, Galveston, Texas: Sewage system;

(21) Base, New York, Governors Island, New York: Sewage system;

(22) Station, Portsmouth Harbor, New-castle, New Hampshire: Mooring facilities, garage and workshop buildings;

(23) Various locations: Aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, planning and acquisition of sites;

(24) Arkansas River: Aids to navigation to complete marking of river;

(25) Various locations: Automation of manned light stations;

(26) Various locations: Replace lightships with very large buoys;

(27) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia: Galley/mess building;

(28) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia: Advanced Engineman School classroom and laboratory building;

(29) Training Center, Cape May, New Jersey: Gymnasium and recreation building;

(30) Training Center, Alameda, California: Recruit barracks;

(31) Training Center, Cape May, New Jersey: Medical-dental building;

(32) Various locations: Public family quarters;

(33) Various locations: Advance planning, construction, design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law; and

(34) Various locations: Automatic fixed station oceanographic sensor systems and monitor buoys.

SEC. 2. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1969 for payment to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of

railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of the navigable waters of the United States in the amount of \$5,-800,000.

SEC. 3. During fiscal years 1969 through and including 1970, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating is authorized to lease housing facilities at or near Coast Guard installations wherever located for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such Coast Guard installations. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual or multiple unit basis. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed the average authorized for the Department of Defense.

Mr. GARMATZ (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 7, delete "\$38,904,000." and insert in lieu thereof "\$67,904,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 9, delete "one" and insert in lieu thereof "three".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 9, delete "cutter;" and insert in lieu thereof "cutters;"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 2 immediately after line 4, insert the following: "None of the vessels authorized herein shall be procured from other than shipyards and facilities within the United States."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to an amendment which I introduced last year and which was accepted by the committee.

It provides simply that all of these ships shall be built within yards in the United States.

In view of our present situation as to the balance of payments and other fiscal problems, it seems to me we must build ships within the United States and that we must preserve the shipyards in the United States and so be in a position of not having to depend upon foreign shipyards for the construction of ships.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection on this side to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the gentleman's amendment on this side, and on behalf of the committee we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because the Calumet region is in the district that I represent.

I would ask the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] to explain the removal of the bridges from the Calumet River.

Mr. GARMATZ. The bridges to be altered, generally, were built with what are now insufficient vertical or horizontal clearance for free navigation on navigable waters of the United States—and they are in the particular district represented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Are the expenses to be borne by the Federal Government in part or in whole?

Mr. GARMATZ. The expenses are paid in part by the Federal Government.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Did the gentleman's committee have complete hearings on this matter?

Mr. GARMATZ. No; not in this particular region where the work is being done. The Coast Guard held hearings on these particular sections, but the committee had no hearings.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. And the recommendations of the Coast Guard and the Army Engineers on this matter have been accepted by the committee?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It is my understanding that hearings were held in the district and that an agreement was reached with local thinking. For the information of those interested, I quote from page 7 of Committee Report No. 1165, as follows:

Last year, for the first time, the Coast Guard acquired responsibility from the Corps of Engineers under the Truman-Hobbs Act for alteration of bridges over navigable waters. Under the law, the Secretary of Transportation makes a determination with respect to those bridges that are obstructive to free navigation and these obstacles are removed on a cost-sharing basis by the Government and bridge owner.

The present projects include replacement of the Berwick Bay Bridge, Morgan City, La., and the Calumet River bridges at Chicago, Ill. It is estimated that the total cost of these two projects will run in the neighborhood of \$28 million, of which \$5,800,000 is provided in this bill.

I further quote from the testimony of Adm. W. J. Smith, Commandant, before the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Navigation, on February 19, 1968, as given on page 31 of the hearings:

Obstructive bridges

Last year we assumed responsibility from the Corps of Engineers for the alteration of obstructive bridges over navigable waters. As you recall the fiscal year 1968 authorization was \$3.8 million. This year's request of \$5.8 million includes phased funding requirements for three of the 16 projects commenced by the Corps of Engineers. Approximately \$47 million will be required in future years to complete projects previously declared obstructive to navigation by the Corps of Engineers.

The only other reference to the removal of obstructive bridges in the hearings is on page 17 where one of the witnesses is quoted as saying that the \$37,963,000 figure for the construction and development of facilities includes the funds for the bridge removal.

Mr. Chairman, I could not let this occasion pass without joining my colleagues in hearty congratulation to the Coast Guard on a job superbly done. It is doubtful if any agency arm, or instrumentality of the Federal Government does so much in so many different fields of activity and with so little money. We in Chicago see very much of the Coast Guard in action, and the more we see the more we admire and applaud.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GILBERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15224) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, pursuant to House Resolution 1095, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1968: HON. FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; HON. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; HON. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., March 18, 1968.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1968: HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York; HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Baring | Hagan | Resnick |
| Blackburn | Halleck | Roth |
| Boggs | Hanna | St. Onge |
| Burton, Utah | Holland | Selden |
| Conyers | Irwin | Shriver |
| Cowger | King, Calif. | Skubitz |
| Davis, Ga. | Landrum | Stubblefield |
| Dent | McEwen | Tunney |
| Derwinski | Miller, Calif. | Watts |
| Diggs | Moorhead | Wylie |
| Dingell | Mosher | |
| Edwards, Calif. | Puroell | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 399 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1096) providing for the consideration of H.R. 15364, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1096

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15364) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1096 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 15364 to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

H.R. 15364 amends the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank—the Secretary of the Treasury—to vote in favor of a \$1 billion increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank and to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe its proportionate share of the increase—\$411,760,000.

The bill also authorizes an appropriation, without fiscal year limitation, of \$411,760,000 for use by the Secretary in subscribing to the increase. Two equal appropriations of \$205,880,000 each will be sought, the first in 1968 and the second in 1970, as called for in the April 1967 resolution of the Board of Governors of the Bank, which is the basis for the present action. These subscriptions as such involve no budgetary expenditure and it is not foreseen that the shares once subscribed will be called by the Bank for cash payment by the United States.

The Bank's Latin American member countries will subscribe to \$544,900,000 of the \$1 billion increase, and the balance of

\$43,340,000 will remain unassigned on the books of the Bank.

The Inter-American Development Bank is continuing to provide leadership and funds on normal banking terms for the acceleration of Latin American economic and social development. In fulfilling this fundamental objective the Bank has become a key element in the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1096 in order that H.R. 15364 may be considered.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has stated, House Resolution 1096 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 15364 to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, as our member of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank, to vote for a \$1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank and to agree for the United States to subscribe our proportionate share, \$411,760,000.

Callable capital stock subscriptions are really contingent liabilities of the subscribing nation which enables the Bank to borrow in world capital markets for lending to Latin American nations, the members of the Bank along with the United States. Such subscriptions are not paid in cash when subscribed for. Appropriations covering our prior subscriptions totaling \$611,800,000 have been made. They are carried on the books of the Treasury, and no actual funding is involved.

As previously indicated, enactment should have no effect on the U.S. budgetary situation. Appropriations to cover our subscriptions will be made but will only be a bookkeeping entry for the Treasury. Apparently no funds need be set aside in a separate account nor have any actually been expended in the past. The purpose of the appropriations by member nations is to create a reservoir of credit upon which to float Bank borrowings which are used to make development loans.

The report notes that to insure only a small impact on U.S. balance-of-payments difficulties, the Bank has more and more conducted its borrowing in foreign capital markets.

This bill, the committee points out, is necessary now because of agreements the Bank has made with existing bond holders that it will not make larger borrowings than the U.S. subscription of callable capital stock—now totaling \$611,800,000. Total Bank debt as of December 31, 1967, stood at \$513,600,000, leaving only \$98,300,000 in borrowing capacity. This is insufficient, together with the existing cash balance of \$52,400,000 to finance the Bank's lending operations which are projected at about \$175,000,000 annually.

Under terms of the bill, \$1,000,000,000 in callable stock is to be authorized. The

share of the United States is \$11,760,000, while that of the rest of the Latin American member nations is \$544,900,000. The Treasury will seek two appropriations of \$205,880,000, the first in 1968 and the second in 1970.

The bill was reported unanimously by the committee, but I have certain reservations that the measure not be passed. But, Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15364) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15364, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WINNALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Congress should act promptly and favorably on H.R. 15364 to increase the callable capital of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The Inter-American Development Bank has formally adopted a posture of full cooperation with the United States in feasible measures to help solve the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. In a recent report of the Bank's executive directors it was stated:

In the light of these (balance of payments) problems, which should be regarded as basically transitory in nature, the Bank and its members fully appreciate the difficulties inherent in United States responsibilities in the free world. Accordingly, the Bank proposes to cooperate in the greatest possible degree with the United States in meeting these difficulties by suitable measures, which obviously would be subject to review as conditions change.

Partly in order to achieve a desirable diversification of its sources of funds and partly as an element in its cooperation with the United States regarding the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, the Bank has intensified its efforts in recent years to obtain an increasing proportion of its capital requirements by floating bonds in capital markets other than in the United States. As my colleague has already indicated, during 1967, the Bank

borrowed a net total of \$146 million in the world's capital markets, of which \$36 million—about 25 percent of the total—was raised abroad and \$110 million was raised by two borrowings in the United States. These borrowings brought the Bank's total funded debt to \$513.6 million at the end of 1967, of which \$335 million was raised in the United States and the remainder—approximately 35 percent—was obtained from the Bank's Latin American member countries and from nonmember countries.

On October 15, 1967, the Bank took a further significant action which had the dual effect of helping to generate additional funds from nonmember countries and of showing its understanding and constructive attitude regarding the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. On that date the Bank announced plans for the adoption of measures aimed at mobilizing additional financial resources for Latin America's development from countries not currently members of the Bank. These measures will condition procurement financed with ordinary capital loans in economically advanced nonmember countries on an appropriate contribution of resources to the Bank by the respective country. Procurement under ordinary capital loans now takes place on an international competitive bidding basis.

This new policy, effective January 1, 1968, applies to a list of economically advanced countries initially consisting of Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

The Bank's cooperation with respect to the U.S. balance-of-payments problem is also demonstrated in its handling of the proceeds from the flotation of bond issues in the U.S. capital market. This cooperation has taken the form of undertakings on the part of the Bank to invest in the United States the proceeds from the sale of bonds to U.S. investors in such manner as to eliminate any effect on the U.S. balance of payments until the end of 1969. Under these conditions the Bank's loan flotations in the United States have no early impact on our balance of payments. It is only at a later stage when the proceeds from such issues are disbursed under loan contracts that the Bank's ordinary capital transactions may affect the U.S. balance-of-payments situation. These undertakings to invest proceeds of bond issues in the United States help assure the Bank's ordinary capital operations will have only minimal effect on the U.S. balance of payments.

These actions of the Bank speak for themselves and I urge rapid and favorable action on H.R. 15364.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15364, a bill to authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote in favor of a \$1 billion increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank and to agree on behalf of the United States to secure its proportionate share of the increase—\$411,760,000.

First, I would like to remind the House that I think it is notable that this bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency by a unanimous vote. I think this represents a solid vote of confidence by the standing committee of the House which has legislative jurisdiction over the Inter-American Development Bank. It is also interesting to note that never has the House of Representatives defeated legislation proposing U.S. membership or U.S. subscriptions to multilateral lending institutions. Apparently, the public as well as the Congress prefers multilateral lending institutions to the more traditional forms of bilateral grant assistance. I might also say that this unblemished record of support by the Congress could not have occurred without a solid performance by these institutions; it could not have occurred had Congress uncovered the waste and in certain instance corruption that has been associated with our bilateral grant aid program.

In this connection, I think that Robert N. Burr, author of a book entitled "Our Troubled Hemisphere," published by the Brookings Institution, recently put his finger on it. As we all know, since World War II, the United States has unselfishly committed itself to massive programs of assistance to less developed nations throughout the world. One of the most vexing questions facing the Congress throughout the postwar period was how to "tie" benevolent strings to such foreign assistance without making it appear that the United States was applying too heavy a hand of interference in the internal affairs of these governments. Mr. Burr, in explaining why the multilateral lending approach has been relatively successful in this regard stated:

There are both technical and political advantages to U.S. support of multilateral aid. International bodies can provide a broader range of technical skills and more knowledge specifically relevant to the problems of Latin America than can the United States acting alone. Multilateral agencies can demand conditions from loan recipients that the United States might be altogether unable to obtain or able to only at the risk of alienating the recipient.

Mr. Burr continued:

Thus, by delegating the administration of aid funds to multinational bodies, the United States can work for the desired development of the Latin American nations more effectively and with fewer political problems than by administering its funds directly. Finally, by giving support to multinational aid entities, the United States is contributing to the building of an infrastructure for a peaceful world of free and independent nations.

I might add that U.S. assistance through the Inter-American Development Bank to Latin America already nearly equals our bilateral grant aid. It might also be useful to remind the Members of the House that the Inter-American Development Bank came into being in 1959, and the participation of the United States was at the urging of former President Eisenhower. At the present time its membership comprises 21 Western Hemisphere nations, including the United States.

The Bank's operations are carried out through two principal loan funds or

"windows," the ordinary capital window, which is the subject of this proposed legislation and the fund for special operations which was replenished with additional capital last year.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps another reason a bill of this magnitude can come before us this afternoon with a unanimous committee vote is because this institution, in its brief history, has generated economic and social development projects in Latin America with an estimated total cost of about \$6.4 billion. I use the word "generated" because this magnitude of project activity resulted from loans amounting to \$2.4 billion. In short, the IDB has had a multiplier effect on its loans of approximately 2.7 to 1. I might emphasize that our bilateral grant assistance programs rarely provided a multiplier effect of this magnitude.

It might also interest the Members of the House to know the types of project lending this institution has financed. Agriculture development projects have been the Bank's primary interest, accounting for approximately 23.1 percent of total projects to date. It was at the suggestion of members of our Subcommittee on International Finance that the percentage of projects aimed at increasing agricultural food production be increased even more, and there is evidence that the Bank has accepted many of our subcommittee's suggestions. Of the Bank's loans, 21.4 percent have gone to industry and mining, 16.5 percent to water and sewage projects, 12 percent to housing, 10.2 percent to transportation and communications, 9.4 percent to electrical power projects, and 4.3 percent to education. Preinvestment and export financing accounted for the remaining 3.1 percent.

One of the growing characteristics of the Bank has been the increasing support it has given to Latin American economic integration. Since it was first established, it has sought opportunities to foster the economic union of the Latin American countries in the belief that such unity is one of the most effective means of accelerating the area's development.

Realizing the need for self-help and reform as indispensable to progress, the Bank works closely with the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—which is the multilateral entity which establishes standards of performance and evaluates institutional progress of the member countries, including fiscal and monetary reform. In this regard, the Bank also cooperates closely with the other financing entities in Latin America such as AID, the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program, and others in an effort to avoid overlapping and to interrelate all development programs of the region.

Members of the House should be pleased to learn that the IDB has been making every effort to avoid adverse balance-of-payments impact here in the United States resulting from its lending and borrowing operations. As of December 31, 1967, the Bank had outstanding borrowings amounting to \$513 million obtained in the capital markets of the United States and abroad. Of this

amount, 35 percent was obtained in foreign capital markets, thus relieving a potentially adverse balance-of-payments impact. During the past 2 years nearly 60 percent of its borrowings have been in foreign capital markets. Last October, the Bank took a further significant action when it announced plans for the adoption of measures aimed at mobilizing additional financial resources for Latin American development from countries not currently members of the Bank. These measures will condition procurement financed with ordinary capital loans in only those economically advanced nonmember countries which contribute resources to the Bank.

Finally, regardless of the merits of any proposal before the House in these troubled times, we must be especially careful of the budgetary impact. In this regard, the IDB has not needed to call any of its present callable capital and the funds appropriated for the U.S. share thus far have remained with the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we take favorable action on this legislation during this session of Congress if the Bank is to maintain its current level of operations. The Inter-American Development Bank has often been called the Bank of the Alliance. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am proud of the bipartisan support Congress has always shown for hemispheric progress. I am certain that an overwhelming majority of the House will again give its stamp of approval to this excellent institution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 2 of the bill, line 3—quoting in part—"to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe to its proportionate share of the \$1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank"—and it provides for an authorization of \$411,760,000.

What is the proportionate share involved? What is the basis for the proportionate share of the United States?

Mr. WIDNALL. In this institution our share is less than 50 percent. I do not have the figures with me here, but I shall get them for the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. If my recollection is correct, the figure is 41 percent.

Mr. GROSS. But what is the basis for our "proportionate share"? Who fixes the proportionate share of the U.S. Government?

Mr. WIDNALL. This is based, after talks and after agreements between the nations who are going into the operation, and the program is based upon the specific interest of the United States in helping development of the South and Central American States; and much has been utilized for the purchase of products in the United States which policy has

provided employment and opportunity for employment in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I still do not have an answer to the question as to how the "proportionate share" of the United States is actually arrived at.

What official stipulates as to what the United States will put into this Fund?

Mr. WIDNALL. No official stipulates this amount. This is arrived at after agreement, after consultation between the nations involved.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. This agreement was included in the initial charter which was established for this institution. We have two different participation accounts, one is the fund for special operations. We had that matter pending before us last year and that largely involves soft loans. The other facet of the operation is the hard loan window. Here the percentage was established by a director appointed by each nation in the original drawing up of the charter. This procedure is adhered to by the participating nations involved. Since the Bank has been in existence, this has been the case.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So, then, an aggregation of individuals can meet down at Rio de Janeiro and vote to impose a tax upon the people of this country by the indication of saying, "You will put up so much money"; is that right?

Mr. WIDNALL. This is not forced upon the people of this country. The Congress of the United States has the ability to enact its will if it feels the proportionate share is unfair, unwise, or anything else.

We are delighted with the operation of this Bank, and some others, where we have been able to get the accord, the interest, and the participation of many, many other nations into an agreement where we do not have the big and majority share we used to have in connection with promoting overseas programs.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I would say, in support of the answers which have been just given by the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Tennessee to the gentleman from Iowa, that those answers are completely correct.

The original 41 percent of the U.S. share of paid-in capital was determined when the articles of agreement were signed, and those articles of agreement were fully ratified by the Congress of the United States, by both this body and the other body, and subjected to full and searching debate.

That percentage cannot be changed without the consent of the Congress of the United States. And I point out that, although our share of the paid-in capital is 41 percent, our vote is 42 percent. We gained that fractional percentage point.

I would also point out that we are the only wealthy country in an organization of poor countries, yet they are putting in 59 percent of the total capital.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My concern is with the balance-of-payments program and the international financial condition that this country finds itself in. I wonder if the gentleman would address himself to the authorization here of \$411,760,000, and to what effect, if any, in his opinion, this will have on the balance-of-payments problem?

Mr. WIDNALL. I do not believe it is going to have any adverse effect on the balance-of-payments problem, or program, as far as the United States is concerned. This is callable, and we have much more that is callable currently in the program that has not been called.

This organization has been able to keep going by outside borrowings by the issuance of securities that have been sold in other countries. It has been a tremendous program in promoting some good will throughout the Western Hemisphere, and we have a multilateral agreement and we do not anticipate any adverse effect on the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, perhaps I can answer, and add some clarification to the question asked by the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. What we are doing is, in effect, guaranteeing operations of the Bank without any input of U.S. capital whatsoever. There is outstanding about \$750 million callable, none of which has ever been called since the inception of the Bank. But in order to get money on the open market, this Bank needed some collateral, some security, and that is the callable stock. With this collateral they can float a half-billion-dollar loan on the European financial market, get a better interest rate, and get more money put up. This callable stock is needed in order to back them up. And that is the real purpose of the American participation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. I do not have control of the time.

Mr. WIDNALL. I have control of the time. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Some of that comes from the United States, of course; does it not?

Mr. BROCK. I am sure the gentleman would not object to the U.S. banks loaning money on which they get a significant return.

Mr. CURTIS. I will have something to say about that later. We are talking about whether it has an impact on the international balance of payments, and the answer is, Yes, of course it does.

Mr. BROCK. I would frankly disagree, because I do not believe you can consider our investment as a direct effect on the balance of payments.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have

control of the time, and I have consumed about 18 minutes. I have other Members I have to yield to, so I decline to yield further.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H.R. 15364. It is not often that this House has the opportunity to act on legislation which is so amply justified by need and so amply justified by deed as this bill to authorize U.S. participation in an increase of the callable ordinary capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank. The need has been fully demonstrated and the actions—the deeds—of the Bank in furthering the economic and social development of our Latin American sister Republics are beyond question. Thousands of acres of otherwise infertile land have been brought under cultivation as a consequence of the Bank's loan and technical assistance operations. Potable water and workable sewage and drainage systems have been brought to millions of Latin American citizens who have not had such simple—and perhaps too much taken for granted in the United States—amenities for centuries. Latin cities have power, reliable and usable electric power, for houses, for factories, and for industry, because of this Bank's lending operations. There are now thousands of miles of highways, bearing trucks and cars, carts and bicycles, where before there were dirt roads and trucks. Markets have been opened where none existed before. Ports to accommodate ships to take the produce of the farms and factories have been created. Educational facilities have been created and improved. Technicians and advisers are helping, under the auspices of the Bank, to create viable economic systems, to overcome handicaps bred in poverty and ignorance, to show the way for Latin American progress and prosperity.

The Bank has not, of course, and cannot be expected singlehandedly to solve all of the economic problems of Latin America. Bilateral assistance is still needed. Private investment has an extremely important role to play. And the Latin Americans themselves must channel their funds and their resources into this great task. But the Bank, acting both as a direct lender and as a catalyst encouraging the flow of funds to needed economic and social development projects in Latin America, must continue its great work. Action on this bill will serve this purpose and I urge that the Congress act promptly to approve this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I join my chairman and the members of the Banking and Currency Committee in supporting this legislation.

The Inter-American Development Bank is a regional hemispheric agency whose members are all the Latin American countries—except Cuba—and the United States. The Bank's legal existence dates from December 30, 1959. The most recent member, Trinidad and Tobago, joined the Bank in 1967. The stated pur-

pose of the Bank is to contribute to "the acceleration of the process of economic development of the member countries." Since it began operations in 1961, the "Bank of the Alliance," as it is sometimes called, has assumed a role of central importance in the planning and financing of economic and social development in Latin America.

The basic capital available to the Bank consists of its ordinary capital resources and its fund for special operations. In addition, the Bank administers the social progress trust fund of \$525 million for the United States, and several other special funds established by Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Britain amounting to \$85 million.

At this time the Bank has committed almost all of the capital available to it for its ordinary operations, and without affirmative action by this Congress and by each of the other member governments will be unable to continue its activities at an adequate level. Most of the Latin American members have already taken appropriate action. Concurrence by the United States will bring the increase into effect. The bill before us today asks us to endorse and support the future operations of the Bank. Although this would include an authorization of \$411.7 million, it is unlikely that a single dollar of these funds, like our earlier contributions to the callable resources of the Bank, will ever be spent. It is essentially a bookkeeping transaction.

Recently, things have been quiet in Latin America. I feel that this is due in no small measure to this institution which is working so hard to fulfill where it can, the rising expectations of the Latin American people. The United States indicated its deep interest in the process of peaceful development and our commitment to provide financial support for development in signing the Alliance for Progress. The Bank's work is an essential element of the Alliance. The investment which is being proposed here, that the United States make in this Bank, may be preventive medicine which will obviate the necessity of larger authorizations for funds to cope with more serious military problems in our own hemisphere. I urge you to support the Banking and Currency Committee by voting in favor of H.R. 15364 as reported.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15364, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine on what grounds one could oppose this legislation, as I shall explain shortly. Our subcommittee on International Finance held hearings on this bill and not a single voice was raised against it. Rather, there was nothing but praise for the bank operation and objectives.

The bill would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote for a \$1 billion increase in the callable capital stock of the Bank, and would authorize the proportionate U.S. contribution to this increase of \$411.8 million. On the basis of this added stock, the Bank, which has currently almost reached the limit of

its borrowing and lending capacity, would be able to make additional borrowings from which it could offer loans for constructive development projects in Latin America.

As brought out so eloquently by the distinguished chairman and by the ranking minority member of the full committee, the history of the Inter-American Development Bank since its inception has been one of sound financing resulting in significant contributions to the economic progress of the Latin American nations. The Bank's total authorized loans of \$2.4 billion through December of 1967 have initiated projects of a total cost of \$6.4 billion. Thus, these loans have succeeded in generating a majority participation in the relevant projects by non-Bank sources.

The repayment record of the Bank's borrowers has been outstanding; only two loans, or about 1 percent of total commitments, are in default, and even these have not yet been written off the books and processes for recoup are now taking place. And I should point out that these loans were made in the earlier days before the more rigid terms were established. Furthermore, the relatively recent policy of requiring Government guarantees for these loans more or less insures that even this remarkable repayment record will be surpassed.

The extraordinary soundness of the Bank's financial position relates directly to the minimal effect the added U.S. participation will have on our domestic budget or international payments deficit. The new contribution is to be in the form of callable capital; that is, capital which is on call as backing for Bank borrowings from private investors. It is from these borrowings that the Bank's loans are made, rather than directly from subscribed callable capital. Our contribution serves merely as a guarantee to the private investors that their loans to the Bank will be repaid.

Thus far, there has been no call on that capital we have already subscribed to the Inter-American Development Bank, and the soundness of that institution's operations indicate little probability that there will be any greater demand for an actual transfer of this additional subscription. Thus, it is likely that no funds will, as a result of our new contribution, actually change hands. We are merely earmarking certain funds as a guarantee to private investors, a promise that, in the event of a default by one of the Bank's borrowers, the Bank will not lack money to pay off its debts.

The only possible effect of this expanded callable capital subscription on our balance-of-payments position would be an indirect one. There would be no direct capital outflow to the Bank from the U.S. Government but the Bank might, with its added supply of guarantee funds, float new bond issues; some of these might be sold in the United States and would then constitute a private capital outflow.

First, however, we must note that the Bank has initiated a new policy, designed to the greatest possible extent to place additional bond issues in capital markets other than that of the United States. This policy should greatly limit the flow

of private capital from U.S. investors to the Bank.

Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that Treasury Department estimates demonstrate that the overall effect of the operations of the Inter-American Development Bank on our balance of payments has been a positive one. Even before its decision to draw as little private capital as possible from the United States, the demand for U.S. exports generated by the Bank's activities has more than offset the negative effect of private capital outflows in the form of loans to the Bank.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, I find it difficult to conceive of any rational grounds for objection to this legislation. On the other hand, I believe that our commitment to aid in the development of our Latin American neighbors, which is tantamount to a commitment to our own national security and economic prosperity, requires acceptance of this measure. I thus urge overwhelming approval by this body of H.R. 15364.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman, as the ranking minority member of the International Finance Subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock] and other Members of the minority who have interested themselves so constructively in this legislation. I want to commend them for the kind of bipartisan support that they have given to this bill. It bears the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and I think the reasons that are now being given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] are the best evidence as to why it received that unanimous support.

I again want to express my gratitude to the gentlemen.

Mr. HALPERN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, the present bill—H.R. 15364—authorizes our country's participation in an expansion of the callable ordinary capital resources of the Inter-American Development Bank. Participation in this expansion would reflect our country's continued interest in the economic and technological progress of Latin American countries and our desire to accelerate social progress among millions of human beings.

Last April, the Inter-American Development Bank's Board of Governors recommended to member governments that appropriate steps be taken to increase the resources of the bank so that it in turn could achieve greater success in meeting capital requirements necessary for continued economic development. These recommendations included a 3-year increase, starting in 1967, in the Fund for Special Operations, the so-called "soft-loan window" with relatively low interest rates and long maturity

periods, and an increase this year in the callable ordinary capital for hard loans, or loans similar to commercial bank loans with higher interest rates for normal duration lengths. Last year the Congress approved the first recommendation, and the increase of money for soft loans is now being implemented. By approving the second recommendation, which does not involve an actual expenditure of funds, we will help the IADB to raise money by borrowing in the various capital markets of the world.

Since 1960, the Congress has appropriated \$612 million for authorized capital stock of the IADB. This money has remained with the U.S. Treasury—as a guarantee behind the bonds sold in capital markets. H.R. 15364 would increase the callable capital by \$411,760,000, to be subscribed in two equal portions, the first before the end of this fiscal year and the second before 1970. Not \$1 of the \$612 million already appropriated has ever been spent, nor is it likely that \$1 of the proposed \$411.7 million will ever be spent. Our country's guarantee—the strength behind the bonds that the IADB sells—enables the Bank to raise its funds from private sources, both here and abroad, with no or little deleterious effect on our balance-of-payments position. These funds finance sound development projects essential to continued economic growth and social progress of Latin America.

The Inter-American Development Bank is the heart of the Alliance for Progress, and the Bank's callable capital is the heart of its dynamic operations that have been admirably successful in enabling Latin American countries to progress toward the realization of essential national and regional hemispheric goals. By increasing the callable capital in 1968—as we did in 1964—we will help accelerate the pace of progress and decrease the distance between human aspiration and achievement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from New Jersey to use the remainder of his time, for we have only one more speaker on this side.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York said that he could not imagine a rational reason for being against this measure. Well, I will try to present one.

There is no question that the United States is overextended in its expenditures abroad. We are in a very critical situation. The Ways and Means Committee, of course, has one aspect of this overextension in relation to our travel abroad as well as to our private investments abroad.

The same arguments—and I have used them—about the private investment abroad not hitting our balance of payments and being a plus were exactly the arguments that were used by the proponents of the Inter-American Development Bank. Actually this is true.

In my judgment, we are making a big mistake in moving in and cutting off private investment abroad. But the administration is doing it in three different ways:

First, through the interest equalization tax, which we passed and is law, and which I opposed.

Second, through the Executive order cutting back direct investment.

Third, the so-called "voluntary" action of the Federal Reserve System in relation to the lending institutions. What we have before us, I believe, is a job that we have never undertaken in the Congress of trying to bring about some coordination of the various programs—and all of them are good—that come out of different committees.

When we list them—and I am going to try to list them—I think I would list this very Inter-American Development Bank as one of the best and finest. I put my stamp of approval on what the committee has said. Probably by the time we get done relating all these programs together, this bill might even come out intact, but my point is this: We have to review in context all of our overseas expenditures. AID comes out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We need to put that into the pot. Public Law 480 comes out of the Agriculture Committee. Those are good programs. We have to coordinate them. The development banks come out of the Banking and Currency Committee. A couple of weeks ago we had the Export-Import Bank bill here, increasing its amount, and, incidentally, at the same time corrupting, as I pointed out, the Bank as a commercial bank and putting it into financing a lot of military items that are not commercial. This was done without the attempt of the House to coordinate these programs.

The fourth area is military aid, including troops abroad, which comes out of the Armed Services Committee. Of course, as I have mentioned, the Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction over travel abroad, private investment abroad, and so forth. These are our programs. Each committee that does its work in this area can come forth and say, "These are good programs." But when we are talking about establishing priorities, it means rating good programs in relation to each other, and even cutting back on some good ones, so we will not be overextended.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I made the effort on the floor of the House to take the Export-Import Bank out of the arms business.

Mr. CURTIS. I know the gentleman did. If he will recall, I was trying to backstop him. It was a valiant fight, but unfortunately we lost. That is all the more reason why I think I would say this bill is untimely on the floor at this time. What needs to be done is for the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle to get the ranking Members of the five committees I have mentioned, to get them together to talk in terms of all these various foreign commitments we have, to see what priorities we are going to establish.

I am repeating myself. I think if this

exercise were done, and I had anything to do with it, this bill before us would receive perhaps the highest priority—in my judgment, the highest except the private investment abroad, which I think is by far the best—but certainly of governmental programs, this would receive the highest priority.

But we have to do this kind of thing if we are to restore confidence in the United States, if we are to restore confidence that this country will be able to handle its own fiscal affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the record. The House Armed Services Committee has not had jurisdiction over military aid to foreign countries.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the gentleman. There are some aspects they do not have jurisdiction over, but on troops abroad, they certainly do.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the only thing our committee handles—I have been on this committee about 20 years.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman has been, but let me give an example. Just last week, when we had the Export-Import Bank bill for consideration, there was no question of the Armed Services Committee having jurisdiction over how to finance the sale of these military weapons abroad, and the committee has been doing this for years. On certain aspects of military aid, the committee does not have jurisdiction, but it does have over a big chunk of it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think if the gentleman will check the record, he will find it is untrue that the committee has jurisdiction over foreign military aid.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the record is there. I am sorry the gentleman has exposed himself on this.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I think most of the Members would agree with the gentleman from Missouri that we desperately need coordination.

I think the point that needs to be made on this particular bill is that there is no adverse impact on the budget. I personally feel there will be no adverse impact on the balance of payments. I think this bill is a necessary device to maintain our commitments, and I urge its approval.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge that this Committee give its approval to H.R. 15364 a bill "to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes." Action on this bill is to insure that the

hard loan operations of the Inter-American Development Bank can proceed in a sound and orderly fashion over the next 3 years and at a level consonant with the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

Although this bill involves no immediate or, indeed, foreseeable expenditure of U.S. Government funds it is, nevertheless, crucial to the acceleration of economic and social development in our sister Republics of this hemisphere.

The bill would reinforce the lending powers of the Inter-American Development Bank—the IDB—which has been known as the Bank of the Alliance for Progress. It would do this by permitting the Secretary of the Treasury, as U.S. Governor of the Bank, to subscribe to our share of a \$1 billion increase in the Bank's authorized callable ordinary capital. The Latin American members of the IDB, in the spirit of cooperative effort which the IDB has done so much to help generate, will themselves be subscribing to their fair share of this increase in the Bank's callable capital.

This U.S. share of the increased callable capital stock of the Bank would amount to \$411,760,000 to be subscribed in two equal portions of \$205,880,000 each. Callable capital subscriptions of the Bank are contingent liabilities of member governments that serve as guarantees which enable the Bank to borrow in private capital markets. As contingent liabilities, they involve no cash outlay unless needed to meet obligations issued or guaranteed by the Bank. U.S. subscriptions to the callable capital of the IDB previously approved by the Congress have not been the subject of calls and, because of the sound and prudent banking basis on which the IDB has conducted its affairs, it is unlikely that there would be calls on these subscriptions.

The Inter-American Development Bank is a going institution in which the United States and the nations of Latin America work together closely and productively. The Banking and Currency Committee and the Congress may justly be proud of the IDB and of its record. In 1959, on the recommendation of your Banking and Currency Committee, the Congress approved U.S. membership in this Bank—an action which was taken with broad bipartisan support.

On three separate legislative occasions since then, the committee has recommended and Congress has approved authorizations for replenishing both the hard and soft loan resources of the Bank. With this support from the United States, and with the resources contributed and the self-help measures taken by the Latin American countries who are the recipients of IDB loans, the Bank has made a major contribution to the economic development of South and Central America. Its \$2.3 billion of loans of all types, more than matched by financial inputs by the borrowers, have made a very substantial and tangible contribution to stability and progress in the hemisphere.

Today's bill is identical in amount and purpose to the increase in the U.S. subscription to the callable ordinary capital stock of the Inter-American Develop-

ment Bank approved by the Congress in 1964 by Public Law 88-259. Now that the Bank's original paid-in capital has been fully committed, the principal source of funds for financing the Bank's hard loan operations consists of borrowings in the private capital markets of developed countries, including the United States and Europe. These borrowings are made possible by the guarantee to lenders that exists in the form of the U.S. subscription to the Bank's callable capital stock.

When the Bank was established in 1959 it had initial authorized ordinary capital stock of \$850 million equivalent, comprised of \$400 million of paid-in shares and \$450 million in callable shares. Of this original callable capital stock, the United States subscribed \$200 million and the Latin American members of the Bank subscribed the equivalent of \$231 million. The difference between the sum of these two amounts and the original authorized callable capital stock of \$450 million represented the share intended in 1959 for Cuba. The Castro regime did not, however, join the Bank at that time and Cuba is now no longer eligible to become a member of the Bank.

Under the able leadership of its President, Dr. Felipe Herrera, of Chile, the Bank's ordinary capital lending and borrowing operations have grown at a very satisfactory rate. Its first borrowing operation based on its callable capital took place in 1962. By 1964 we in the Congress recognized that maintenance of an adequate growth rate for the Bank necessitated additional callable capital stock to permit the continued borrowings needed to underlie ordinary capital lending activity. In that year, the Bank's authorized callable capital stock was increased by the equivalent of \$1 billion, of which the U.S. share was \$412 million—the same amount being sought under this bill. This \$1 billion increase in 1964, together with an increase of \$300 million of shares to be reserved for subscription by possible new members, brought the Bank's total authorized capital to \$2,150,000,000. The pending increase would raise this amount to \$3,150,000,000 and bring U.S. involvement in the ordinary capital stock of the Bank to \$150 million paid in and \$1,024 million of callable capital. As I have already indicated, none of the callable capital ordinary capital stock subscribed to by the United States to date has had to be paid to the Bank and it has remained as a book entry in Treasury Department accounts.

H.R. 15364 would do three things:

First, it would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury as U.S. Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank to vote in favor of an increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2 of the agreement as recommended by the Board of Executive Directors in its report of April 1967, to the Board of Governors of the Bank.

Second, it would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to agree, on behalf of the United States, to subscribe to its proportionate share of the \$1 billion increase in the authorized callable ordinary capital stock of the Bank.

Third, it would authorize appropriate

tion, without fiscal year limitation, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the increased U.S. subscription to the authorized callable ordinary capital stock of the Bank.

These actions are both desirable and necessary if the Inter-American Development Bank is to continue to play its vital and dynamic role in advancing Latin American economic and social development within the framework of the Alliance for Progress. These actions are desirable and necessary if the Bank is to fulfill the new and challenging responsibilities—especially in the field of financing multinational regional integration projects—it was given in the Declaration of the Presidents of America, signed at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in April last year. It is of the utmost importance to the United States and to the Latin American members of the Alliance for Progress that the Inter-American Development Bank have access to sufficient financial resources to meet its responsibilities—and this is particularly important during the next decade when the Latin American nations will be moving forward, vigorously and confidently, with the creation of the Latin American Common Market which is to be a foundation stone for the erection of a sound, outward-looking, progressive, and prosperous hemispheric economic system.

The presently available ordinary capital resources of the Bank will, according to the best estimates, be exhausted by late this year at the desired rate of lending activity. The proposed U.S. subscription to roughly \$412 million of additional callable ordinary capital stock, which will be more than matched by Latin American callable ordinary capital stock, is essential to enable the Bank to carry out its mission in the Alliance for Progress.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to note briefly that the present bill involves an institution in which the Congress has had a long history of interest and which, reflective of the cooperative spirit of the Alliance for Progress, has a long record of sound management and cooperation with the United States. This Bank is an extraordinary investment for the U.S. taxpayer—under the present bill it is very unlikely that appropriated funds will ever be disbursed. The Bank is a key element in a key area of U.S. foreign policy—the successful Alliance for Progress. The Bank recognizes, and cooperates with, our balance-of-payments policies and programs. This is a sound Bank—with sound objectives—and this is a sound bill, meriting swift and affirmative action by the Congress.

There has been discussion in the last few minutes about the balance of payments, particularly by my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and I should like to walk through this problem with Members for a moment.

Let us look at our balance-of-payments deficit. Our current deficit, overall, last year was \$3.5 billion.

Our military deficit—the result of our troops in Europe, in Asia, and the rest of the world—was \$4.25 billion, more than the entire overall deficit. If we

take our conventional civilian nongovernmental accounts, our trade in and out, our investment in and out, our tourism in and out, we are in surplus. The trouble, purely and simply, is in our governmental military accounts.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Is not the same argument applied against the imposition of the interest equalization tax, the restrictions of the Executive order restricting private investment abroad, and the so-called voluntary restrictions by the Federal Reserve on bank lending? These arguments are sound, and I agree with the gentleman, but if we are going ahead as the Government has restricting the private sector, all I say is, let us get all of these foreign spending programs, the good ones as well as the bad ones, investment and current, put them in a pot, and let us establish priorities.

Mr. REUSS. I could not agree with the gentleman more. The report of the Joint Economic Committee, made public this morning, shows it is the unanimous opinion of the Joint Economic Committee, on both sides of the aisle, that the proposed travel expenditure tax should not be enacted, that the controls on foreign investment should be repealed at the earliest possible time, and within the year, and that we should not impose autarchic restrictions on trade. So I could not agree with the gentleman more. But let us get the cause of our balance-of-payments deficit straight in our minds.

It is our swollen military expenditures overseas that are responsible for this situation, and to deal with those we must deal with those, and not with innocent bystanders, like the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. CURTIS. We have to put them all in together, but the gentleman will agree that we are overextended abroad, will he not?

Mr. REUSS. Absolutely.

Mr. CURTIS. So let us put them all together and see if we can get a set of priorities established for them.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in support of H.R. 15364. We are all aware of the Inter-American Development Bank's outstanding record in its financing of economic and social development in the countries of Central and South America. I believe that there are few banks which can match this record—over \$2.3 billion of loans authorized in 448 loans during the past 7 years and in making these loans the Bank has helped to mobilize \$3 billion of additional development funds from local and other sources. There have been only two small defaults out of these 448 loans and in both cases, the borrowers were private enterprises and in both cases the Bank has instituted legal proceedings against the borrowers. It is expected that the Bank will be able to recover a substantial amount in these litigations. In the unlikely event it recovered nothing whatsoever, its losses would be less than \$10 million, which represents well under 1 percent of its total loan commitments. I might point out in this regard that there have been no defaults

on loans to member countries or agencies or political subdivisions thereof.

The purpose of the bill before us is a \$1 billion increase of the callable ordinary capital stock. At this point in time it should be emphasized that the callable capital of the Bank is a contingent liability of the member countries which can be called only and to the extent necessary to meet obligations of the Bank on securities which the Bank has issued for sale in the private financial markets or on guarantees which the Bank has made. Otherwise, there is no burden on the member governments or on taxpayers in the United States or in the Latin American countries. Calls cannot be exercised as a means of obtaining cash from governments to carry on normal loan operations.

On the strength of the contingent liability represented by the callable capital, which is in effect a guarantee of the member countries, the Bank has been able to go to the private capital markets in Europe and the United States and successfully place its own securities. The proceeds from these bond issues are then available to the Bank as additional capital for lending operations.

Since its inception in 1960, the Bank has borrowed in the capital markets of the United States, Italy, Germany, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Belgium. It has borrowed in Latin American member countries, Spain, and Israel through the sale of short-term bonds to their central banks. It has also borrowed from government agencies in Spain and Japan. The total of all these borrowings now outstanding is nearly \$515 million. Within present capital subscriptions, the maximum the Bank can borrow and have outstanding is \$611.8 million. This figure constitutes a limit because the Bank has covenanted with bondholders not to permit its net borrowings to exceed the U.S. share of the subscribed callable capital.

The Bank's bonds that are floated in the United States are rated AAA and are sold broadly to institutional investors. In fact, every issue has been oversubscribed.

I submit that this is a remarkable record for an institution such as the Inter-American Development Bank. I also submit that action on H.R. 15364 is desirable and needed now and is in the interests of the Bank, of the peoples of Latin America and, particularly, in the interests of the United States of America.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to allow the United States to subscribe to an additional \$411 million worth of Inter-American Development Bank stock. Let me say right now—before I go any further—that I am not talking about sending cash out of the country, but merely about subscribing to more stock so that the Bank's borrowing and loanmaking authority can be increased. There is very little chance that these shares, once subscribed, will be called for cash payment—at least in the foreseeable future. Thus, this subscription should have no effect on the budget and no immediate effect on the balance of payments.

I want to make this point crystal clear:

No money is to be shipped to South America to buy this stock, nor is any increase required in the Federal budget. If either budgetary or balance-of-payment effects were involved, I would oppose this measure because as this Committee knows, I am no friend of the Great Society's domestic and global welfare spending, particularly amidst the present financial crisis.

The reason for this legislation is simple. If the Inter-American Development Bank can increase its authorized stock, then it can borrow more money and make more loans. I prefer this to sending more foreign aid dollars south of the border: we have already given enough handouts to the banana republics. I must prefer the regional development bank approach, because these banks mix local money with ours, and the South Americans are a little more careful with their own funds than with easy come, easy go foreign aid dollars. Given this local involvement, regional development banks are a much better way of assisting foreign economic development than straight handouts. Moreover, these banks make decisions based on familiarity with local problems rather than the long distance ignorance of our State Department.

No doubt you will all recall that the State Department was recently found to be using AID funds to ship expensive cocktail party foods to our high-living diplomatic corps; however, I can assure you that the Inter-American Development Bank runs a tighter ship. It has a good record.

As I noted earlier, the Inter-American Development Bank needs this additional stock in order to increase its borrowing and loanmaking power. Even though no money will be sent out of the United States by this stock purchase, there is another possible balance-of-payments problem. Consider, for example, the loss of dollars which could be involved if the Bank floats new loans in the United States. Thus, even though no dollars flow to South America to pay for the additional stock, the stock will enable the Bank to borrow money—conceivably in the United States—which could result in an outflow of dollars. However, the Inter-American Development Bank, because of the generous support which it has received from the United States, is committed to assisting us in our balance-of-payments problem. The Bank has promised that the proceeds of any bond issues floated in the United States will be left here until the end of 1969, and so it is only at this later date that our balance of payments can be even indirectly affected. It is also worth noting that in 1966 and 1967, only 43 percent of the money borrowed by the Bank—43 percent of \$250,000,000—was borrowed in the United States. In the future, the Bank has promised to try and raise an even larger percent of its money elsewhere. For this reason, I do not think that there will be any dangerous indirect impact on our balance of payments.

I urge the Committee to support this legislation enabling the Inter-American Development Bank to increase its loanmaking and loanmaking authority. The Bank has a good record, and to the ex-

tent that we can aid it without hurting our budget and balance of payments, we should do so.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank.

U.S. membership in the Inter-American Development Bank was authorized by Congress in 1959. The bill we are now considering will permit the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote a total increase of \$1 billion in the callable capital stock of the Bank, and, if the increase is approved by the other members of the Bank to subscribe on behalf of the United States its proportionate share of the increase, \$411,760,000. Appropriations for the U.S. subscription would be requested in two equal installments, the first in 1968 and the second in 1970.

The ordinary capital resources of the Bank consist of paid-in capital and callable capital. Loans from these resources are repayable in the currency lent, on sound banking terms. The U.S. share of callable capital is now \$611.8 million, substantially less than one-half of the total callable capital of the Bank of \$1,750 million. The callable portion of each member's subscription is not available to the Bank for lending, but is a contingent liability of the member countries. It can be called only and to the extent necessary to meet obligations of the Bank on securities which the Bank has issued for sale in the private capital markets or on guarantees which the Bank has made. Except in this highly unlikely contingency, there will be no expenditure of U.S. appropriations for callable capital and accordingly no burden on the taxpayers of the United States. This reliance on the private capital market, with the guarantee of the member countries, has the further virtue of placing on the institution the discipline of the marketplace. The Bank's operations and actions are subject to the screening of the harshest judge of all—the individual investor.

The resources of the Bank also include special funds which are made available on concessional terms in areas of basic economic and social significance. Since it began its lending operations in 1961, the Bank, as of January 31, 1968, has authorized loans and other assistance totaling \$2,391 million—including 155 loans from its ordinary capital amounting to approximately \$900 million. In doing so, it has helped to mobilize an additional \$3 billion in development funds from local and other sources for carrying out the goals of the Alliance for Progress. When completed, the loans authorized by the Bank will result in the construction of 49 large industrial plants and some 3,000 small- and medium-sized plants; the irrigation or improvement of 6 million acres of farmland; the expansion of the electric power capacity by 4.5 million kilowatts; construction of more than 2,000 miles of main highways and 10,000 miles of access and farm-to-market roads; 3,000 water supply systems for the benefit of 40 million people; loans of more than \$100 million for 120 institutions of higher learning with an enrollment of 150,000 students; and con-

struction of some 300,000 houses through savings and loan systems and public housing programs.

The legislation before us will permit the United States to continue its participation, in partnership with the nations of Latin America, in the activities of the Inter-American Bank. The Bank has amply justified our participation by a sound record of performance in assisting the economic development process in the hemisphere. It deserves continued support by the Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15364

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283-283i) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 17. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized (1) to vote for an increase in the authorized capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the agreement as recommended by the Board of Executive Directors in its report of April 1967, to the Board of Governors of the Bank; and (2) to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe to its proportionate share of the \$1,000,000,000 increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Bank.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike "2831" and insert "283m".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin what happens if we run into a world financial crisis. We have seen some of the earmarks of it very recently. Then what happens under this guarantee program, under which our taxpayers are so heavily involved and which you laud so highly here today?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. The guarantee program, in my judgment, would not be affected even if the world's money managers lacked the wit to keep the system in order. The guarantee is solely as to borrowings made by the Inter-American Development Bank, which are in turn secured by the kinds of investments that they make. Bear in mind, these are hard-window investments. These are not warm-hearted schools, healing hospitals, and generous agricultural products, but these are industrial investments and pay-off investments.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Wisconsin would not indict the foreign handout and soft loan program, would he? He has been voting for it.

Mr. REUSS. No. I am all for it. But I just say that we have to separate these bills today. We do not have a handout program today, but we have the hardest-headed banking operation that the gentleman from Iowa has ever seen.

Mr. GROSS. If we do get into a world

financial crisis, then what happens with this Inter-American Development Bank?

Mr. REUSS. Then we can thank our lucky stars that we passed this bill and, in addition to the other assets of the United States, that our hemisphere is economically strong as a result of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Why, if we have to put up hundreds of millions of dollars, would we thank our lucky stars that we got involved in that sort of a situation?

Mr. REUSS. Because we do not put up the money.

Mr. GROSS. Why would any sane person say that? Why?

Mr. REUSS. I will assert that a majority of, and indeed the unanimous majority of, the House Committee on Banking and Currency is entirely compos mentis, and they all said that the most sensible kind of investment is for us to let the private bankers put their money into Latin America, and that is what this bill does. It is not the money of the U.S. taxpayers, but private investment capital. By building a strong hemisphere at no cost to the taxpayers of the United States, I cannot imagine a better shield and bulwark to an international crisis than that.

Mr. GROSS. Please do not take quite all of my time, because I might have to get out one of those little slips of paper in order to get a little more time.

The gentleman spoke of this great, wealthy country of ours a few moments ago. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that this Government has more debt than all of the rest of the governments of the world combined? Just how wealthy are we, anyway?

Mr. REUSS. Well we are the wealthiest country in the world. We have more improved real estate, more consumer goods, more capital goods, better scenery, more glorious feeder cattle in Iowa, than any country on the face of the globe.

Mr. GROSS. You failed to mention that wonderful thing known as the "gross national product."

Mr. REUSS. Our gross national product amounts to more than \$800 billion, which dwarfs the national debt. The ratio of the national debt to the gross national product is more favorable than it has been, as an historical fact, for the last generation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more fallacious than the gross national product as a yardstick of our economic well-being.

Mr. REUSS. In my opinion, it is a very good yardstick. I cannot think of a better yardstick to use, related to the material wealth and welfare of mankind, than the total of goods and services that we produce.

Mr. GROSS. Far more accurate would be the yardstick of net national income.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], that I fail to find anywhere in this report accompanying this bill, any indication that the occupant of the White House is for this bill, or for that matter, that anyone else in the administration is for this bill.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to page 2 of the report.

Mr. GROSS. Well, just permit me to finish the sentence.

If we cannot get the President or someone in the administration to say that they are for this bill, then perhaps we can get candidate KENNEDY or candidate MCCARTHY to state a position.

Mr. REUSS. I am sure that we can get them to do so.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to find somebody in the present administration to state that he is for this bill.

Mr. REUSS. Splendid. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, in response to the interrogation which has been propounded by the gentleman from Iowa, there is set forth, in black-letter type at page 30 of the hearings held upon this legislation, in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, directed to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the signature of Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies; of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Acting Secretary of State; of Alexander B. Trowbridge, Secretary of Commerce; of Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington; as well as of Andrew F. Brimmer, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Well, where are the usual departmental reports on this latest outpouring of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is such an indefatigable reader of committee hearings and reports, I am sorry that the gentleman has not seen this in the committee hearings, but on February 24, 1968, as contained in the hearings held on this bill there is the following:

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies solemnly and completely endorse this measure.

Signed by Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury; Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Acting Secretary of State; Alexander B. Trowbridge, Secretary of Commerce; and Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care about that. You can read the letters which are addressed to your committee to your heart's content. We ordinary Members do not receive letters from the Secretary of the Treasury. Where in the report accompanying this bill do we find the endorsement?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman will refer to page 31 of the hearings, the gentleman will find the special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies on the proposed increase in the ordinary capital resources of the Inter-American Development Bank of February 1968.

Mr. GROSS. The report which I hold in my hand has only nine pages.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have reference to the hearings which were made available to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman from Iowa will find this set forth in such detail that he will hear more about this Inter-American Development Bank than he ever wants to hear again.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that someday we can bring an end to this business of a bunch of Americans going over to New Delhi, or to Buenos Aires, or to some other cockeyed place around the world—Timbuktu, or Ouagadougou—and there sitting down with a group of foreigners and agreeing that the U.S. share of this fund or that fund, for the purpose of our participation therein, is going to be 41 percent or 70 percent. I hope we can summon the courage around here to someday say to the people of this country that Congress and only Congress will make these deals. Let us put an end to this business of a few individuals taking trips abroad and coming back to say to Congress that "we have been down there and a commitment was made, and now you have got to pick up the check."

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that, while members of the Committee on Banking and Currency have gone to Buenos Aires, to the best of my knowledge none have gone to Timbuktu or Ouagadougou.

Mr. GROSS. Well, some of you do not have to go to Timbuktu, or any place else, in order to make a commitment of this kind. If you do not go Vice President HUMPHREY will be flying around, as he was when he flew over to Africa not so long ago, making commitments to pave roads, build dams, and so forth, at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, President Johnson has put restrictions on American investors who seek to invest their money abroad. The citizens of this country have already been bilked out of some \$152 billion in various forms of foreign aid and we have been told for years that that was for the purpose of providing a climate abroad favorable for private investors.

Now we are told exactly the opposite and today we are being called on to dedicate another \$411 million to an international financing institution. This simply does not make sense and I am not going to put this obligation on the American people no matter how vivid the colors that are being used here today to paint this picture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to carry on the colloquy a bit more on the priorities of our foreign spending. I pointed out the manner in which the administration has restricted private investment abroad. I have been pointing out, trying to, at any rate, for a number of years, that I felt that the Curtis corollary to Gresham's Law was operating on foreign spending. That corollary is; namely, that Government money drives out private money. The reason I want to get this program and these other Government spend-

ing programs and investment programs all together along with these private ones, is to take a look at priorities, where the Government, our Government, the Johnson administration, has restricted private investment abroad in a very serious way ever since the interest equalization tax, and now is moving in even further in its restrictions. At the same time, the same administration is before the Congress asking to expand its expenditure programs and its investment programs, here in the Inter-American Development Bank, and we are going to have the Asiatic Development Bank in for an increase. We already considered the increase for the Export-Import Bank.

Now, I do not favor carrying out this imbalance of increasing Government investment abroad in lieu of private. I happen to think private moneys are much better invested. They are under much greater disciplines, and therefore there is less impact on the balance of payments. Actually, this determines whether we will have a greater plus in our balance of payments. We have two pluses, balance of trade, our exports over our imports and from our investment abroad. Our income from our private investments abroad have exceeded the plow-back of investments. This is the area the Johnson administration has sought to restrict to cut back on the overextension of the United States expenditures abroad instead of in the governmental area.

So I am saying the timeliness of this particular bill is questionable. I believe it would be well for the House to recommit this bill to the committee and get together with these various committees that have jurisdiction over our various foreign spending programs, and let us establish priorities.

I will speak strongly for this particular one, because I believe it is among the best. Where I would like to see us cut in is on the AID program, which is so foolishly administered in so many respects, and certainly in many aspects of the military expenditures abroad, particularly our troops in Western Europe and elsewhere.

And then finally I would be asking Japan, for example—which only spends about 3 percent of its gross national product on defense because of its constitution, and probably just as well, but all the more reason Japan should be the ones who are putting up more in the Asiatic Development Bank along with other countries in Asia and assisting with the problem of the less developed countries, instead of the United States.

The U.S. Government is overextended, and now here is the time for the House of Representatives to demonstrate our understanding of this.

Put this bill aside, recommit it to the committee, and let us get on with the deliberations to find out how we can balance our international payments.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I presume the gentleman knows that under the President's message, 110 percent approximately of previous years' investments in underdeveloped countries will be permitted. The

countries of South America are considered underdeveloped countries.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman because the gentleman obviously has not been listening to the debate. I pointed out that that is exactly the type argument used for private investments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to clarify the colloquy that was had a minute ago with the gentleman from Missouri.

I got in touch with the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and they tell me that foreign military aid—which I thought was what the gentleman was talking about and aid under NATO—are not under the jurisdiction of those committees.

Of course, U.S. military authorities and soldiers abroad are under the jurisdiction of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I was talking about that—and I think perhaps I was not clear. When I said "military aid and troops abroad," I was referring to our troops abroad and that is where the misunderstanding may have arisen.

Mr. BENNETT. When it comes to a question of our troops abroad that is under the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. But the operation of military aid is not under the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. I misunderstood what the gentleman was saying. Now we both understand each other so it is all right.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, you see what I was trying to do was to put it in context of the various committees that had jurisdiction over some aspects of our spending abroad and I was pointing out that our Armed Services Committees had jurisdiction over this aspect—and it is a sizable sum.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand. I just misunderstood the gentleman. I thought the gentleman was referring to foreign military aid as to which there is no jurisdiction either in the House or Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to voice any opposition to the bill before us, but to ask a question or two for the purpose of clarification of the members of the committee.

You will all recall, I am sure, that in 1965 this Congress enacted legislation to exempt from the antitrust laws banking communities that voluntarily cooperated in limiting lending in foreign countries.

My question is this: If it is good for the U.S. Government to provide guarantees in this type of international banking operation, why then, is it bad for the

private banks of this Nation to make loans without limitations for development abroad, be it through approved programs that are involved here, or for any type of investment, whether it be industrial or otherwise, in a foreign country?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has asked a good question. The answer is very simple. It is good for the United States, by this legislation, to permit the private capital market to serve the needs of Latin America.

Equally, it is good for the private enterprise system of this country to make capital investments abroad in the developing areas of Latin America and elsewhere. That is why there is an exception written right into our interest equalization tax, and voluntary controls and mandatory controls of capital investments abroad. It is not only to save but to encourage private capital investments abroad.

The gentleman is right, but the prohibition is simply not there.

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman knows, of course, that this is an exemption which was necessary because there was indeed a question of violation of the antitrust laws if members of the banking community got together—had agreed to limiting the amounts of funds from the private sector for investment abroad. It became necessary because of the possible interpretation of the antitrust laws to enact this legislation, which the Congress passed. The result of it was to permit the banking community to get together in what otherwise would normally be a violation of the antitrust laws and agree to limitations with regard to private capital to be made available for foreign loans.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to again yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Those limitations relate only to private capital investment in developed areas, such as Western Europe. I would go on to say that I think even there these limitations are an evil, albeit for the immediate present—perhaps a necessary one—but happily there were no limitations and are no limitations on private capital investment in the developing areas, and that is precisely the kind of area which this bill seeks to let the private capital market help.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, but certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin knows that as long as this bill becomes fiscally feasible in that, as I understand, the Bank has had a wonderful record and has sustained no loss, then certainly under these conditions one would not suspect we would sustain any losses for such investments made in Western Europe, where in fact the very nature of the economy would dictate that it would be more successful than perhaps investments made in Latin-American nations. Is that not correct?

Mr. REUSS. I share the gentleman's feeling that the sooner we can once

again permit free American private investment everywhere in the world, including developed Western Europe, the better; specifically, as I said a moment ago, I hope within the year that will be permitted, because we "kill the goose that lays the golden egg" when we tell American private investors that they cannot invest abroad, because if they cease to invest abroad we will get no return back from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COLLIER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COLLIER. I engaged in this colloquy, and I think it is meaningful, for one other reason: Inasmuch as the problem, and the critical problem of balance of payments has come up today, and when one reviews the actions taken now for the past 8 years, the four basic steps that have been taken thus far to deal with our growing serious balance of payments and the pending proposal to deal with it further through the imposition of taxes on American tourists abroad, I seriously doubt whether this Congress can accept at face value these recommendations because, after having accepted those recommendations of the past, we do indeed find ourselves in a far more critical position in our balance of payments than ever before in our history. I quite agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin in making the observation as he did that unless we get to the prime causes of this problem, primarily the military personnel abroad, we will never solve the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the increased United States subscription to the capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank, \$411,760,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15364) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1096, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 15364 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 126, nays 271, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—126

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abbott | Gardner | O'Neal, Ga. |
| Abernethy | Gathings | Passman |
| Adair | Goodling | Poff |
| Andrews, Ala. | Gross | Pollock |
| Ashbrook | Gurney | Price, Tex. |
| Ashmore | Haley | Pryor |
| Baring | Hall | Quillen |
| Battin | Hammer- | Randall |
| Beicher | schmidt | Rarick |
| Bell | Hansen, Idaho | Reid, Ill. |
| Berry | Harrison | Reifel |
| Blanton | Harsha | Roberts |
| Bow | Henderson | Rogers, Fla. |
| Bray | Hull | Roudebush |
| Brinkley | Hutchinson | Rumsfeld |
| Broomfield | Ichord | Satterfield |
| Brown, Ohio | Jarman | Schadeberg |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Jonas | Scherle |
| Buchanan | Jones, Mo. | Schneebeli |
| Burke, Fla. | Jones, N.C. | Scott |
| Burleson | King, N.Y. | Shipley |
| Bush | Kleppe | Sikes |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kornegay | Smith, Okla. |
| Carter | Kuykendall | Snyder |
| Chamberlain | Laird | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Clancy | Latta | Stratton |
| Conable | Lennon | Stuckey |
| Cunningham | Long, La. | Taylor |
| Curtis | Lukens | Thompson, Ga. |
| Denney | McClure | Thomson, Wis. |
| Devine | McCulloch | Tuck |
| Dickinson | McMillan | Utt |
| Dole | March | Waggonner |
| Dorn | Martin | Wampler |
| Dowdy | Miller, Ohio | Watkins |
| Downing | Mills | Watson |
| Duncan | Minshall | White |
| Edwards, Ala. | Montgomery | Whitener |
| Everett | Morton | Whitten |
| Flynt | Myers | Winn |
| Fountain | Natcher | Zion |
| Fulton, Tenn. | Nichols | |
| Fuqua | O'Konski | |

NAYS—271

| | | |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adams | Bevill | Burton, Calif. |
| Addabbo | Blester | Button |
| Albert | Bingham | Byrne, Pa. |
| Anderson, Ill. | Boland | Cabell |
| Anderson, Tenn. | Bolling | Cahill |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Bolton | Carey |
| Annunzio | Brademas | Casey |
| Arendt | Brasco | Cederberg |
| Ashley | Brook | Celler |
| Aspinall | Brooks | Clark |
| Ayres | Brozman | Clausen |
| Barrett | Brown, Calif. | Don H. |
| Bates | Brown, Mich. | Clawson, Del. |
| Bennett | Broyhill, Va. | Cleveland |
| | Burke, Mass. | Cohelan |
| | | Collier |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Colmer | Hosmer | Price, Ill. |
| Conte | Howard | Pucinski |
| Corbett | Hungate | Quile |
| Corman | Hunt | Rallsback |
| Cramer | Irwin | Rees |
| Culver | Jacobs | Reid, N.Y. |
| Daddario | Joelson | Reinecke |
| Daniels | Johnson, Calif. | Reuss |
| Davis, Wis. | Johnson, Pa. | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Dawson | Jones, Ala. | Rhodes, Pa. |
| de la Garza | Karsten | Riegle |
| Delaney | Karsh | Rivers |
| Dellenback | Kastenmeyer | Robison |
| Dent | Kazen | Rodino |
| Dingell | Kee | Rogers, Colo. |
| Donohue | Keith | Ronan |
| Dow | Kelly | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Dulski | Kirwan | Rooney, Pa. |
| Dwyer | Kluczynski | Rosenthal |
| Eckhardt | Kupferman | Rostenkowski |
| Edmondson | Kyl | Roush |
| Edwards, La. | Kyros | Roybal |
| Ellberg | Langen | Ruppe |
| Erlenborn | Leggett | Ryan |
| Esch | Lipscomb | St Germain |
| Eshleman | Lloyd | Sandman |
| Evans, Colo. | Long, Md. | Saylor |
| Evins, Tenn. | McCarthy | Scheuer |
| Fallon | McClary | Schweiker |
| Farbstein | McCloskey | Schwengel |
| Fascell | McDade | Sisk |
| Feighan | McDonald, | Slack |
| Fino | Mich. | Smith, Calif. |
| Fisher | McFall | Smith, Iowa |
| Flood | Macdonald, | Smith, N.Y. |
| Foley | Mass. | Springer |
| Ford, Gerald R. | MacGregor | Stafford |
| Ford, | Machen | Staggers |
| William D. | Madden | Stanton |
| Fraser | Mahon | Steed |
| Frelinghuysen | Mailliard | Steiger, Wis. |
| Friedel | Mathias, Calif. | Stephens |
| Fulton, Pa. | Mathias, Md. | Sullivan |
| Gallifanakis | May | Taft |
| Gallagher | Mayne | Talcott |
| Garmatz | Meeds | Teague, Calif. |
| Gettys | Meskill | Teague, Tex. |
| Glaimo | Minish | Tenzer |
| Gibbons | Mink | Thompson, N.J. |
| Gilbert | Mize | Tiernen |
| Gonzalez | Monagan | Udall |
| Goodell | Morgan | Ullman |
| Gray | Morris, N. Mex. | Van Deerlin |
| Green, Oreg. | Morse, Mass. | Vander Jagt |
| Green, Pa. | Moss | Vanik |
| Griffin | Murphy, Ill. | Vigorito |
| Griffiths | Murphy, N.Y. | Waldie |
| Grover | Nedzi | Walker |
| Gubser | Nelsen | Whalen |
| Gude | O'Hara, Ill. | Whalley |
| Halpern | O'Hara, Mich. | Widnall |
| Hamilton | Olsen | Wiggins |
| Hanley | O'Neill, Mass. | Williams, Pa. |
| Hanna | Ottlinger | Willis |
| Hansen, Wash. | Patman | Wilson, Bob |
| Hardy | Patten | Wilson, |
| Harvey | Pelly | Charles H. |
| Hathaway | Pepper | Wolf |
| Hawkins | Perkins | Wright |
| Hays | Pettis | Wyatt |
| Hebert | Philbin | Wyder |
| Hechler, W. Va. | Pickle | Wyman |
| Heckler, Mass. | Pike | Yates |
| Helstoski | Pirnie | Young |
| Hicks | Poage | Zablocki |
| Hollifield | Podell | Zwack |
| Horton | Pool | |

NOT VOTING—36

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Betts | Halleck | Nix |
| Blackburn | Herlong | Purcell |
| Boggs | Holland | Resnick |
| Burton, Utah | King, Calif. | Roth |
| Conyers | Landrum | St. Onge |
| Cowger | McEwen | Selden |
| Davis, Ga. | Matsunaga | Shriver |
| Derwinski | Michel | Skubitz |
| Diggs | Miller, Calif. | Stubblefield |
| Edwards, Calif. | Moore | Tunney |
| Findley | Moorhead | Watts |
| Hagan | Mosher | Wylie |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

| |
|---|
| Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Derwinski. |
| Mr. King of California with Mr. Mosher. |
| Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck. |
| Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Betts. |
| Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Michel. |
| Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. McEwen. |
| Mr. Purcell with Mr. Skubitz. |

Mr. Watts with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. McMILLAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT FOR THE LEADER OF OUR NATION AND PARTY: LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record today on where I stand on the matter of Democratic Party leadership.

I support President Lyndon B. Johnson for reelection in 1968. And I urge all Democrats to join with me in continuing to support a President who has earned the right to affection and respect.

I am proud to support a President who has kept more than 90 percent of the campaign pledges he made 4 years ago to the American people, a President who has led the way to unprecedented social welfare legislation—landmark programs in education, health, civil rights, and the war on poverty.

I am proud to support a President who has provided the kind of leadership that resulted in a period of uninterrupted economic prosperity. The record will show that by his urgings to the American people, we have determined to do something about urban decay, wasted human resources and the economic and social inequities in our midst.

I am well aware of what administration critics are saying about Vietnam.

But what are the alternatives to the administration policy. We have heard nothing substantive from his opponents in both parties. And the reason we have not heard any reasonable alternatives articulated is that this administration is following the best and most reasonable course in this complex situation.

No American wants this war to be con-

tinued. Unfortunately, Hanoi is not quite as impatient as we are. President Johnson cannot negotiate with himself. He cannot force the Communists to the peace table. Nor, may I add, has he taken the kind of desperate and dangerous escalatory steps that could expand the conflict and edge the world closer to world war III.

I know President Johnson. I have worked closely with him for many years. And I wholeheartedly concur with the late President Kennedy's view that Lyndon Johnson is superbly qualified to be President of the United States.

It is worth remembering that President Kennedy chose Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President because, as President Kennedy said, he wanted to protect the best interests of the Nation by having as his replacement the best man for the White House.

This was John F. Kennedy's judgment. Events since his tragic death have borne out the wisdom of his decision to make Lyndon Johnson his constitutional successor.

Today, 5 years later, Lyndon Johnson has earned the right to stand among the great Democratic Presidents of our time. For our President has displayed the courage to meet difficult international situations of a Wilson or a Truman; he has demonstrated the legislative accomplishments of a Roosevelt; and the social compassion of a John F. Kennedy.

We Democrats have an excellent candidate for President in 1968.

His name is Lyndon B. Johnson. And in January 1969, we will proudly assemble at the steps of the Capitol to attend his inaugural.

These are difficult and challenging days for us all. But let us remember that we have the leadership, the program, and the will to keep faith with the American people and to promote the best interests of the Nation we serve.

The Democratic Party, under the banner of President Johnson, shall stand before the American people in 1968 with a proud record of accomplishment. And the people, in fairness and commonsense, will give us the victory we have earned.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President.

Mr. Speaker, we can have only one President at a time and, in time of war or otherwise, we can have only one Commander in Chief. President Johnson has made an outstanding record as President of the United States. I do not mean to imply that I have supported all of his proposals and programs but that is beside the point. Not all Democrats, and certainly not all Republicans, have agreed with him at all times, but he has provided a magnificent leadership.

He needs and deserves the support of the American people in these days of crisis and in the coming days. Despite

the fact that this is a campaign year, the welfare of our country must be put above all other considerations.

The President has called for austerity as we confront decisions involving the war and the challenge to the dollar and our economic security. I applaud this further move toward facing up to our problems at home and abroad.

Of course, I support the President as the leader of the Democratic Party and at the proper time I shall advocate his reelection, but my objective in rising today is to support him as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. There will be abundant time later to consider political matters. The welfare of the country must take precedence over partisan considerations and all other lesser issues.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] upon their statements here today and say that I thoroughly agree with their every word. We have the hardest working, competent President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and we are going to reelect him in November.

BACKING UP L. B. J.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the majority leader and my colleagues in voicing my support for our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and his continued efforts to construct a peaceful world, to find self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, to contain China, and to arrive at some peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union. There are those who ask for negotiation and for painful compromise. The President has asked for negotiation, and he can get none. I suspect that painful compromise means painful for the South Vietnamese people but not for Ho Chi Minh. I wonder if those who ask for painful compromise would consider the remarks made by a newsman here in the Capitol who had recently come from Vietnam in which he said that Ho Chi Minh wants no part of a one-man one-vote settlement in South Vietnam, because the vote would only be 15 percent in favor of the Vietcong. He said this was the commonly accepted percentage that the Vietcong would get in any free vote in South Vietnam. So I feel that the President should be supported and permit the South Vietnamese to achieve their self-determination and let them vote for their own government. Let the Vietcong have their 15 percent obtained without force and their terror tactics and not some sort of coalition which would provide them with a predeter-

mined Vietcong participation in advance; a coalition which to Ho Chi Minh means our surrender and immediate withdrawal and Communist control of South Vietnam.

SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT IN THE TIME OF MILITARY CRISIS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am prouder than ever of our distinguished majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the remarks that the gentleman from Oklahoma has made today in support of the President of the United States. I am proud to be associated with Members from New York to California in this expression on the floor of the House today, an expression of confidence that we have a great leader in our President, that this Nation will be wise, Mr. Speaker, both at the Democrat Convention and in the national elections, to recognize the great leadership qualities of the President of the United States, and to continue him at the helm of our ship of state.

It may or may not be significant, Mr. Speaker, that among men who have served our country in time of war, men who have fought on the many battlefields, who have fought in the air, and who have fought on the seas, we find a great body of support for our Commander in Chief today. Many of us were in attendance at the ceremonies when the Veterans of Foreign Wars honored the Congress of the United States, and I do not think there was a man present who was not impressed that night by the great demonstration of support and understanding which came from the Veterans of Foreign Wars in behalf of the President of the United States.

Later today, Mr. Speaker, I shall place into the RECORD a resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the Disabled American Veterans, an organization uniquely qualified in my opinion to pass judgment on the merits of our Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, it is further significant to me that this outstanding committee has firmly gone on record in support of the Commander in Chief and in support of his efforts to win the war against the Communist aggression and the attempt to enslave the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is my further opinion that the people of the United States of America appreciate demonstrated qualities of leadership and the substance of leadership, and will be more interested in that in November than in Madison Avenue merchandising or imagemaking in the selection of their President.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to endorse what has been said here today, by our great Majority Leader CARL ALBERT and other prominent Democrats, in support of President Lyndon B. Johnson. I endorse what has been said in favor of his nomination for President and his election for another 4-year term in November.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any President of the United States has been so successful in achieving his promises when he was elected to the office as President of the United States than President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to compare, or attempt to compare, President Johnson's record of achievements, a record which represents many achievements—I will say that we could not do that very well when making that comparison based upon just one former President, of the United States. In other words, we would have to compare his record in many instances and in a great many major instances with all of the former Presidents of the United States. If this were done, one would find that in some instances his record is much better than that of other Presidents who have preceded him in the occupancy of that Office. We have always had in my opinion outstanding and dedicated Presidents, however, Mr. Speaker, through the efforts of President Lyndon B. Johnson in the field of education, for instance, more has been accomplished in the recent past than has been accomplished in the entire history of the United States of America under all other Presidents; more has been accomplished to extend needed help to the poor and to the low-income groups, as well as in the field of hospital care, medical care, and achievements in bringing into being a wonderful program for the benefit of all the people and especially the plain people of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to endorse what has been said about his reelection.

PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record at this point in endorsing everything that has been said concerning our great President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. I am one who feels that it is time for the American public to stand up and be counted on whether or not he is doing the job that he should do, and whether or not some of these Johnny-come-latelies who flip-flop from one side to the other are the kind of candidate we want for President.

My Democratic colleagues might well keep in mind the fact that no President

has accomplished so much in the field of human welfare as has President Johnson. To deny him the opportunity to continue advancing his program might, and probably would, result in slow strangulation of what already has been accomplished.

The constituents of Democratic Members have benefited extensively from President Johnson's programs. Certainly it would not be realistic to expect these benefits to continue under a President of another political party that consistently has shown little regard for the welfare of the little people of this Nation. Nor could it be expected that they would continue under a different Democratic President. Those who would seek to deny Lyndon Johnson his party's nomination have not always demonstrated the same concern for the little people as has President Johnson.

There are many who are not in full agreement with the President's policies in Vietnam. Yet, as our distinguished majority leader noted, the President cannot negotiate with himself; he cannot force the Communists to come to the peace table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject of our great President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri object to that request?

Mr. HALL. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman object to my requesting permission that all Members who have spoken on this subject may revise and extend their remarks?

Mr. HALL. I would not. That is quite all right, but I believe that all Members should walk down the sawdust trail if they want to join the bandwagon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleague from Missouri is correct—we should be willing to walk down the sawdust trail, and I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks that have been made here today because it seems to me that at this time, when the President is beset from every quarter, the people of America should think carefully about

who they want to be their President from now until November, and who they want to be our President after that.

I believe President Johnson has been doing a magnificent job as our leader. Again I say to our colleague from Missouri—we should walk down the sawdust trail, and it is a special pleasure to say this to the gentleman from Missouri, because the State of Missouri once gave us a real President, President Harry Truman, and at that time many did not wish to walk the sawdust trail for him.

Mr. HALL. I wish he was back.

Mr. IRWIN. I would say to the gentleman that I am afraid he might not recognize President Truman's great qualities if he were here leading us today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the majority leader for his forthright expression of support for President Johnson. His accounting of the accomplishments of President Johnson and his enactment of over 90 percent of the Democratic program as it was enunciated at the Los Angeles convention of 1960 is a testimony to the leadership he has shown, not only to the Democratic Party and to the 87th, 88th, 89th, and 90th Congresses, but to the American people as well.

No man can quarrel with President Johnson's domestic accomplishments. They are unparalleled in the legislative annals of American history. Today America is faced with one of the greatest threats in the history of our democracy. We all know that in 1945 an intermittent cold and hot war was declared by Communist Russia and was joined in 1949 by Communist China. The threat in the Southeast Asia theater has met the same resolute action by the United States that the threat in the Northwest Pacific met in 1950.

President Johnson has been carrying out an American policy as enunciated and defined by President Truman, and supported by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. No internationalist in my memory has done more to try and settle the differences that exist between East and West in Vietnam.

Hanoi has consistently refused to come to the bargaining table. Their support, both in military hardware and ideology, has come from Moscow and Peking. A settlement in this area could come at almost any time, if they will but respond to America's offers. President Johnson has taken virtually every initiative to bring all of these forces to the conference table. To this day they have seen fit not to respond. I feel that the President is the most qualified American to deal with

this threat and that his formula for a lasting, permanent, and honorable settlement is the only sound course of action.

I want to reassure him and to assure the American people that I support him in this endeavor.

CONGRESSMAN MCCARTHY SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in light of the events of the past weekend, I wish to join with other Members of the House who earlier today expressed their support for President Johnson. Over the weekend I was home, and there was great consternation, as I suppose there was all over the country. However, it seems to me that most people in western New York, in Erie County and the Buffalo area, while they are gravely concerned about the crises confronting our country and want peace, as we all do, tend to be standing with the President of the United States in a time of difficulty. I would hope that we Democrats can get through this period between now and the primaries with at least some modicum of gentlemanliness and decorum, and, after it is all over, that we will be united. And, finally, I express the hope that after the November elections the whole country will be united. For I am afraid that our adversary is not going to come to the conference table until he sees that the United States is united and determined to see this tragic conflict through to an honorable conclusion.

FOR BIPARTISANSHIP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to an excellent editorial which appeared in yesterday's Philadelphia Inquirer and I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point in the RECORD.

While the civil rights bill which recently passed the Senate does not go as far as I would like, nonetheless, it was a tremendous step forward in view of the special filibuster problems which face the other body. It will be a tragedy indeed if the House does not pass the Senate bill as is without delay. Any attempt to amend the bill or send it to conference would clearly make the bill a target for another filibuster in the Senate and its future would be in grave doubt. To adopt the Senate bill without change requires

solid bipartisan support in the House. I wholeheartedly agree with the editorial's closing paragraph:

Human dignity should be above partisanship. There should be bipartisan effort to enact, this year, a civil rights bill worthy of the American people.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 18, 1968]

FOR BIPARTISANSHIP ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Even in an election year there ought to be agreement among Democrats and Republicans in Congress on such fundamental matters as equal opportunity and equal justice for all Americans.

Unfortunately, there are indications that some members of the House of Representatives may be inclined to play politics with the civil rights bill approved by the Senate last week. Talk is centering on amendments to the bill which might have the net result of blocking enactment this year.

There is nothing basically wrong with proposing amendments to any bill, if the purpose is to improve it. However, amendments for the purpose of stalling or defeating legislation are another matter entirely. Congressmen who do not want to stand up and be counted on the open housing issue, in an election year, would like to ensnarl the measure in some sort of parliamentary deadlock so they could avoid the question for now.

Tinkering with the Senate bill—not to improve it, but to delay it—would be an unwarranted and ill-timed frustration of efforts for genuine civil rights progress. Amendments would risk prolonged stalemate in a House-Senate conference committee, or another filibuster in the Senate. Four roll calls were required in the Senate this month to invoke cloture by the narrowest of margins, and break a seven-week filibuster against the civil rights bill. Another filibuster, late in the session, might be harder to halt.

The open housing section of the civil rights bill passed by the Senate is substantially weaker than the open housing law already in effect in Pennsylvania. Some Congressmen contend, nevertheless, that the open housing provision in the Senate bill should be watered down. Their line of reasoning is difficult to follow.

Human dignity should be above partisanship. There should be bipartisan effort to enact, this year, a civil rights bill worthy of the American people.

THIS IS A MODEL CITY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Housing and Urban Development designated Butte and Helena, Mont., as model cities. The mayors, the local committees, and, of course, the entire Montana congressional delegation were pleased with and grateful for this designation.

All Members of this body who have had cities in their districts approved for model city planning funds are certainly well aware of the tremendous local effort which is needed in preparing the necessarily comprehensive applications. The goal which we have won—and no

other district in the Nation has received two model cities designations—represents the success that can be achieved when local and Federal officials work closely together. This is a tribute to cooperation.

But, Mr. Speaker, model city designation is not really the goal; it is just the beginning. I am very pleased to see this realization reflected among the local committees and in the press in my district. The groundwork has been laid but everyone involved knows that ours must be a continuing effort until the day when Butte and Helena are, indeed, model cities.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial which appeared March 14 in the *Helena Independent Record*. It reports far better than I could the tremendous enthusiasm and the aspirations which are so evident in these fine communities. Butte and Helena know the opportunity which is now theirs and this outstanding editorial is an example of the splendid community spirit which assures that the final, important goal will be won.

The editorial follows:

AN ENCOURAGING START

The turnout at Monday's meeting of the Model Cities Committee was encouraging in terms of numbers (about 70) and in the community leaders represented.

Most encouraging was the spirit. There was no letdown after victory, no feeling of, okay, we got our designation, now we can relax. Instead, it was, okay, we've got our designation, the big job is ahead.

There was recognition, too, that there will be some opposition in Helena to the Model Cities program which must go to a vote of the people once the plans are completed.

The opposition is likely to come from two main sources:

Persons who are against using federal funds to improve the city. (Model Cities provides up to 80 per cent federal participation in urban renewal and other programs.)

Persons who, possibly for selfish, possibly for esthetic, possibly for sentimental reasons, disapprove of the final plans.

Vern Coughlin, chairman of the Model Cities Committee, made it clear at Monday's meeting that his committee wants full community participation in developing the plans, not only with respect to urban renewal but for the social, cultural and historical phases of the Model Cities program as well.

Certainly it will be necessary to hire professional help, Coughlin said, but "what we say we want to do with our community counts the most." This planning phase, he pointed out, "is where the people of Helena will have the most to say."

To those who object to the use of federal funds, Coughlin issued this invitation: "I say to them that if they want to join in and show where private endeavor can replace federal funds, I'm all for them."

After all, he explained, the over-all objective of the Model Cities and urban renewal programs is to encourage private capital to re-invest in abandoned and deteriorating neighborhoods. And it is working. In California, areas designated for urban renewal programs have seen private capital moving in ahead of federally financed projects.

The second group of potential opponents may be harder to define and harder to convince. There will be the guy who wants his property spared and the other who insists his be taken.

There will be those who insist on restoring some architectural monstrosity because of its dubious historical or esthetic value, even though it may be deteriorated beyond restoration.

There will be differences of opinion on the best future use for the areas now blighted, especially in this historic south gulch area.

We would say to these potential opponents:

Participate fully in the planning.

Participate with constructive imaginative ideas.

Participate with informed opinion, not fuzzy notions.

Participate in the spirit of what is best for Helena, not your personal fortune.

Think in terms of growth, for Helena is growing now and will grow faster as a Model City, and growth makes intelligent planning essential.

Then, once the over-all plan is completed, accept it as the consensus of what is best for Helena and support it with enthusiasm, even though you may disagree with portions of it.

Mayor Darryl Lee promised at Monday's meeting that the people of Helena will be kept completely informed, through the news media, of everything that goes on in the Model Cities program. This, too, is encouraging—and it is vital. When the plan goes on the ballot, the people must know what they are voting on and they must be convinced it is the best course for their city.

If the spirit shown so far is maintained, we're sure it will be.

MILK BONANZA EXCEPT TO CONSUMER, FARMER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the farm editor of the *Springfield, Mo., Leader and Press*, Mr. Tom Ellis, has a long-standing and much-deserved reputation as a knowledgeable and articulate observer of the problems faced by the dairy farmer. For some time he has questioned the wide disparity between the profits of the dairy producer as opposed to those who process, distribute, and market his product. In the March 17, 1968, issue of the *Springfield Leader and Press*, he has articulated this question with a great deal of factual investigating and reporting.

A careful reading of the article shows that in the elaborate chain of milk pricing regulations, there is a missing link which protects everyone in the dairy industry against changing market conditions, except the farmer whose labor and risks are greater than anyone else's in the link between the cow and the consumer. I am calling this article to the attention of both the House Committee on Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture, but I think it is well that all Members of the House be aware of one of the major reasons why there is so much discontent on the farm today, I include the article, "Milk Bonanza Except to Consumer, Farmer" at this point in the Record:

[From the *Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press*, Mar. 17, 1968]

MILK BONANZA EXCEPT TO CONSUMER, FARMER—FARM INCOME 2 CENTS LESS, BUYERS UP 6 CENTS IN YEAR

(By Tom A. Ellis)

Next Thursday at 1 p.m., an interim committee of the Missouri Legislature, comprised of an equal number of senators and

representatives, will open a hearing at Farmers Room of the Greene County Courthouse.

That committee was set up by the past session of the legislature to study the marketing of agricultural products of the state from farmer to consumer—to hear the gripes reaching all the way back from consumer to farmer.

Agriculture's contribution to the Springfield economy runs perhaps \$2.5 million a week, affecting not only farmers but town and city dwellers to tremendous extent. But a spokesman for the committee expressed some doubt consumers would be willing to attend.

One day this week, a reporter for these newspapers checked the milk display cabinet of one of the city's larger foodstores. Stepping it off, he measured the display case at 30 feet by 3.5 feet, give or take probably no more than inches; thus it occupied roughly 105 square feet of floor space.

Next, the newsmen counted the cartons and carton space—the counter was not quite full, seldom is because of the fast turnover of milk. The way it was stacked, the cabinet would hold 276 half-gallons of milk, and 80 full gallons. No count was made of the quarts, today a relatively inconsequential matter.

The half-gallons were selling for 59 cents, the gallons for \$1.15, about the same as for several months. The wholesale price of that milk in February, according to federal reports, was 50 cents a half-gallon, with no price listed for gallons. Because of cheaper packaging and handling, it is a safe assumption that wholesale prices on gallons is somewhat less, proportionately.

So the store clears 9 cents a half-gallon on milk? Wrong! It makes that plus other substantial benefits, including discounts.

There is nothing new in discounts for volume buying—and nothing wrong, probably. How high they range on milk is a carefully guarded secret, but in Springfield they are reputed to run 12 to 14 and even 16 percent—figures previously published and never denied.

Assume this store got 12 percent; on a 50-cent wholesale price per half-gallon of milk, that would knock off another 6 cents, reducing actual cost to 44 cents and giving the store a profit of 15 cents. That would be nearly a 34 percent profit on a commodity that turns regularly and fast.

If the discount were 14 percent, add another cent to the profit; 2 cents if it were 16 percent.

The markup on chocolate milk is probably slightly less, for it has sugar and chocolate added, but profit runs more on buttermilk and the so-called "health" (low butterfat) milk, and probably even higher on quarts.

But ignoring the quarts, that display case still held the equivalent of 266 gallons of milk. "It would be a poor day's business when the entire contents of the case didn't turn over at least twice in that store," a man who has been in the milk selling business in Springfield told the reporter.

But to be conservative—just as in using the 12 percent discount instead of a larger one—consider the turnover is 500 gallons a day, 360 days a year (if the store closes on holidays as most of them don't, except perhaps on Christmas). At this conservative rate that dairy case would be earning the store \$150 a day, \$1050 a week, or \$54,000 a year, in round figures.

Suppose the case of milk turns only once a day—still more than half the 500 gallons used hypothetically in this example and still a bonanza. However, another spokesman well versed in milk marketing, said the 500-gallon estimate was not high; some big markets "turn closer to 1000 gallons a day," he declared.

Of course, this isn't all profit. There is the use of 105 square feet of floor space, the cost of checkouts at the cash register plus managerial costs, rent or its equivalent, and taxes.

Even here, there are compensating factors. The store doesn't buy the equipment; the dairy does. It never bothers with stocking or re-stocking; the dairy does that, too, three or four times daily. Any spoilage is absorbed by the dairy that supplies the milk.

Nor is that all, the store also operates on capital supplied by the dairy. The store pays twice a month for what it has purchased in the past two weeks, and has the interest-free use of those accumulating dollars until the next bill-paying day.

No slight matter, either. If the mark-up of one-third of cost nets \$150 a day, then the wholesale price must be twice that: \$300 a day, or \$4500 for 15 days. That would average \$2250 a week of milk plant money which the store has the year around, free of interest.

And if the store is one of a chain of four or five or more doing business in Springfield, this thing begins to look like the real bonanza it is, with the cost of borrowing what it is today.

Figured on annual percentage, the earnings from milk sales would be dizzying, astronomical, incredible!

Remember, this same store may be glad to get an 8 percent markup on another commodity that doesn't turn a case a week.

Consumers may consider the farmer the villain in this case; his share of that half-gallon of milk the customer pays 59 cents for figured at just a fraction less than 20 cents for February production. It may seem unfair he made more than the store did.

Or it's possible the consumer sees something else: That he and the farmer have a common cause for complaint. However, those city dwellers seeking more material for gripes—just in case they plan to attend that legislative "gripe session" this week—will find no dearth of it.

A year ago, Springfieldians were paying 53 cents a half-gallon for milk. Now they are paying 59 cents—the result, milk plants explained, of two price hikes to farmers. In each case, stores increased the retail price by more than the wholesale price boost they took.

So, willing or not, consumers were helping area farmers. Or were they? Producers in the Springfield market got 2 cents a hundred pounds less for milk last month than they received a year ago.

Plants are careful to inform the public when prices go up; seldom consider it newsworthy when prices go back down.

Then where did that extra 6 cents you're paying go? A good question to ask your legislative probers.

Actually, farmers today are receiving just about the same price for milk they did 20 years ago—sometimes less. Yet, in those two decades, how often have milk prices to consumers advanced on the excuse farmers were being paid more?

Corner the retailer or the bottler and ask them about it. They'll tell you all their costs have gone up, and it's true—all except the cost of the raw commodity they process and sell. Doesn't it ever occur to anyone that costs of production go up for the farmer, too?

Viewing it another way: In February, according to the U.S. Agriculture Department's monthly report on milk marketing, there were only about a dozen cities in all America where a gallon of milk cost as much as in Springfield; only seven where the cost of a half-gallon was as high, and in only two cities—Lubbock, Tex., and Tucson, Ariz., was the retail markup as great.

Yet in the more than 70-odd federal milk marketings in the nation, only one other has a price as low or lower to farmers than the Springfield market.

In Springfield last month, plants paid about \$5.78 a hundred pounds for milk, including premiums, and consumers paid 59 cents a half-gallon; in Kansas City, plants paid \$6.05 and stores sold it at 43 to 49 cents a half-gallon. In Houston, Tex., for just one of many other contrasting examples, bottlers paid \$7.15; consumers, 54 cents a half-gallon.

Price-conscious local consumers, are quick to report on prices outside of Springfield. One called last week to say he had been in a Joplin store, one in a chain operating out of Springfield, and there found milk selling for 55 cents a half-gallon, the same brand as that store carries in Springfield. That milk was being hauled 70 miles and retailed 4 cents cheaper than to Springfieldians—home folks.

Another told of being in Parkville last month, in the store of "an old friend" when the day's delivery of milk was made. The Merchant gave the Springfieldian his sales slip for proof. The wholesale price was 37.5 cents a half-gallon (50 cents here), and milk retailed at 45 cents a half-gallon, three for \$1.29.

Merchants do sell "leader" items at a loss, but is it necessary to subsidize a Central American banana grower, a Brazilian coffee grower out of the pockets of Ozarkers, both farmers and consumers?

The Missouri Legislature, in its past regular session, entertained a bill intended to correct the inequities of milk marketing—one that would have protected the consumer.

It was killed in 10 days largely through the efforts of two national chains of stores. "Please, Mr. Legislator, Don't Raise the Price of My Baby's Milk!" wept full-page ads in the state's largest newspapers. Advertisers were thoughtful enough to provide the telephone numbers of legislators voters might contact to prevent this outrage against chain store profits.

The bill, which had been expected to pass, went down to defeat—but the price of "Baby's Milk" didn't go down a cent.

The fate of this bill almost certainly had something to do with the hearing scheduled here Thursday—and Friday, if enough consumers are interested to appear before it with their complaints. After all, they're the ones who pay their money; they're entitled to their choice.

THE "SPLENDID LITTLE WAR" AND A MAN WHO SERVED IN IT—HON. BARRATT O'HARA OF ILLINOIS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, 70 years ago next month, on April 25, 1898, Congress declared the existence of a state of war with Spain. John Hay called it "a splendid little war," and many historians say it was the most far-reaching step in the history of our Republic. At the end of the war, 10 weeks later, we had acquired a colonial empire of 120,000 square miles and 8,500,000 people. The United States had attained the rank of world power, whose strength and potential had to be taken into account by the nations of the world.

One of our colleagues, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois, was part of all this and for some years has been the only Member of the U.S. Congress who served in the Spanish-American War. What years of destiny this man's life has spanned. Consider, for a moment, that his eyes that saw rifle smoke from the old black-powder Krags today see the contrails of jet planes flying 6 miles above the earth. He and his comrades in arms thrilled to the saga of the battleship *Oregon*, steaming at flank speed around

Cape Horn to join Admirals Sampson and Schley outside Havana Harbor—and today he accepts as commonplace the existence of guided missiles that span half the earth in 30 minutes.

In his service to his country, 70 years ago, he wore the same uniform as did William Jennings Bryan, who served as a National Guard colonel, and as Generals "Fighting Joe" Wheeler and Fitzhugh Lee, who just 30 years before had worn the gray of the Confederacy as they gallantly fought against the very same Army they were now to serve.

BARRATT O'HARA could tell us of men whose phrases and deeds have been enshrined forevermore in American history. Hobson, who sank the *Merrimack*; Lieutenant Rowan, who delivered the famous message to Garcia; Commodore Dewey's "You may fire when ready, Gridley!"; Captain Philip, of the battleship *Texas*, who admonished his men "Don't cheer, boys, the poor fellows are dying!"; and Teddy Roosevelt, that giant among men, who was to go from a colonelcy to the Presidency of the United States.

There are few left now to connect America in the late 1960's, the awesome bulwark of defense against aggression that it has become, with those days when our feet were irrevocably set on the road we have followed ever since. BARRATT O'HARA may be the last man still in public life who serves his people, his State and his country so well by his reminder to us of what we were and how we became what we are.

Abraham Lincoln said "we cannot escape history." We should not try; we should not turn our backs on our past: it is when we close our eyes to these things—and to these men, who were a part of it and whose voices are still loud and clear—that we begin to lose sight of our heritage and the sources of our greatness.

BARRATT O'HARA was an eyewitness to and part of this event in our history that had implications far beyond what anyone knew at the time. He saw and took part in deeds that led directly to making us what we are today. It was only 10 weeks, this war, yet without it the history of the world would have been far different.

Among us, today, and for his people, his State, and his country, he renders a service no other man can give: he is a constant reminder to us all not only of what we were, but what we have become, and how we have tried to fulfill the destiny that fate has thrust upon us.

WELFARE SYSTEM NEEDS REVISION

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, though we often hear the cry from the less compassionate that our Nation is progressively becoming more socialistic, the fact of the matter is that the United States uses less of its national wealth for the social welfare of its citi-

zens than other advanced, industrial nations and frequently less than many poor and developing nations.

While West Germany and Luxembourg use 17 percent and 16.8 percent respectively of their gross national product for social welfare measures, the United States uses only 7 percent.

It has long been my contention that the United States has not adequately met its overall social welfare obligations and, in particular, has failed to sufficiently care for our senior citizens.

A step in the right direction was realized when this Congress enacted the recent increase in social security benefits.

However, with respect to those senior citizens receiving public assistance we have danced the minuet. There simply was no increase in benefits in some States for those on public assistance as has been so eloquently pointed out in an editorial that appeared in the March 12 edition of the Providence Journal. The 13-percent increase, which was designed to bring benefits in line with the cost of living, has been deducted from the welfare checks of those receiving social security benefits.

Once again it appears to be a matter of conflicting State and Federal Government legislation: We give with one hand and take away with the other.

Under unanimous consent I insert the poignant article previously mentioned in the RECORD with the intent of making the Members of this House cognizant of the need for reform in our welfare system:

SOCIAL SECURITY DILEMMA

When is an increase in Social Security benefits not an increase? The answer is when the beneficiary also is receiving public assistance.

In Rhode Island and many other states, when the Social Security payments increased by 13 per cent this month, a corresponding amount was deducted from the welfare checks of those receiving the old age stipend, canceling out what was designed by Congress as a cost-of-living increase. The action was taken, said James H. Reilly, state public assistance administrator, because the state's welfare system provides that all sources of income for welfare recipients must be treated alike. If income received by one recipient is disregarded, he explained, then it must be disregarded for all.

The question of whether this is fair can be argued at length on both sides of the issue. Some say those who have earned Social Security benefits by their contributions to the plan over the years should not be penalized. On the other hand, it is argued, public assistance is designed to supplement the income of those in need, and favored treatment for some would be inconsistent with the policy of a single standard for all.

Federal law contains a "disregard" provision that has never been adopted in Rhode Island. It could be put into effect by the state Department of Social Welfare, disregarding \$7.50 of income regardless of the source, if the governor and attorney general approved. The department is known to be considering this step. It has been urged in the General Assembly. In our view it should be thoroughly explored.

The savings the state will realize by reducing payments to aged, disabled and blind persons who receive Social Security would be an ill-gotten gain at the expense of people unable to provide adequately for themselves. There seems good reason to adopt the \$7.50 "disregard" provision as a much fairer alternative. According to Mr. Reilly, to do so would cost the state an estimated \$300,000 in

addition to restoring the \$200,000 deducted from Social Security recipients.

The real issue is much larger than the present case might indicate to some. The real problem is national in scope and is based on the need for a major overhaul of the welfare system to provide some form of social insurance that would not leave hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged Americans with less than the minimum required for a decent existence. Until reforms are adopted by Congress, the inequities and inadequacies exemplified by the present Social Security dilemma will continue to plague those trying to administer the law and those forced by circumstance to depend upon it.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACTION PROGRAM FOR A STRONG U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our merchant marine is playing a valiant role in connection with the logistical problems of the conflict in Vietnam, I commend for reading by Members of Congress a report issued by a joint labor-management committee on maritime affairs. It goes without saying that I endorse the findings of this labor-management committee and its 15-point program for an adequate American merchant marine.

The report follows:

FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

"There is no dispute that our Merchant Marine is woefully inadequate. We are now carrying—and this is a startling figure—under 8 percent of our foreign waterborne trade. The United States has dropped to 16th in the world's shipbuilding statistics. While the world fleet increased by 61 percent in the last 15 years, America's privately owned fleet has decreased by 24.5 percent."

This deplorable condition must be corrected immediately. We must revitalize the U.S. Merchant Marine. Our national security, as well as our pressing domestic problems, characterized by the balance of payments situation, cry for action now.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

1. Thirty-five to forty new commercial ships a year.
2. Operating differential subsidy for non-berth vessels as well as liners for foreign trade, retaining the basic parity concept.
3. A positive program for the revitalization of passenger ship fleet.
4. An extension of tax deferred construction reserve fund to all American merchant and fishing vessels.
5. A more simplified system for determining construction-differential subsidy retaining parity as a basic concept of such support.
6. Research and development funds to revitalize the Merchant Marine and expand the cargo carrying capacity of U.S. ships, with full guarantees for jobs and security for the workers to be carried out.
7. Establishment of a quasi-judicial subsidy board.
8. Establishment of a revolving construction reserve fund to provide for continuing fund replenishment from customs receipts.
9. A fleet of nuclear powered vessels for foreign and domestic commerce.
10. The strengthening and full implementation of the Cargo Preference laws.

11. Opposition to the Department of Defense appropriation for the Fast Deployment Logistic Ships.

12. Support of reorganization plan to place the Maritime Administration in the Department of Transportation and Cargo Preference in Marad.

13. Support of measures (S. 2056 and S. 2087) to require U.S. citizens for replacements in foreign ports and eliminate abuses of provisional registry.

14. Support for the revitalization of the fish industry (bill to be introduced shortly).

15. The use of U.S. flag ships in greater numbers as a positive tool to help eliminate the U.S. dollar gap.

Maritime Labor-Management Unity

Committee; For labor: Joseph Curran, National Maritime Union; Thomas W. Gleason, International Longshoremen's Association; Jesse M. Calhoun, National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association; Lloyd Sheldon, International Association of Masters, Mates and Pilots; William J. Steinberg, American Radio Association; Carroll Armstrong, Great Lakes Seamen, Local 5000, United Steelworkers of America.

For management: Marinos Costeolos, Albatross Shipping; Manuel Diaz, American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines; Urban C. Ambrose, Blidberg Rothchild Co., Inc.; Erik F. Johnsen, Central Gulf Steamship Corp.; Fred L. Thielking, Clipper Marine Corp.; Ivo Matkovic, J. W. Elwell Co.; R. K. Riley, Farrell Lines, Inc.; Cliff Rowland, Grace Line, Inc.; E. V. Demson, Intercoastal Shipping and Trading; Frank A. Nemes, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.; Eugene A. Yourch, Marine Transport Lines, Inc.; Captain J. B. Cecire, Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; Joseph G. Barkan, Prudential Lines, Inc.; Charles Nisi, Sperling Steamship and Trading Co.; J. K. Adams, States Marine Line; J. J. Malafronte, Transamerica Steamship Corp.; R. D. Carter, Transamerica Trailer; E. J. Heine, Jr., United States Lines Co.

A BROAD LOOK AT OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, with the increasing tempo and tenor of the Vietnam debate here at home, two recent articles on Vietnam caught my attention—not only because of the challenges proposed, but for the reasoning contained therein. These assessments of the present Vietnam situation lend credence to the widely held views that alternatives to the policy now being pursued should be thoroughly and conscientiously explored. Dr. Edwin Reischauer's article, "A Broad Look at Our Foreign Policy," taken from the New York Times, March 10, 1968, and the editorial from Life magazine, March 15, 1968, follow:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Mar. 10, 1968]

A BROAD LOOK AT OUR ASIAN POLICY

(By Edwin O. Reischauer)

The Japanese continually talk about the *doronomia*—the quagmire—into which America has sunk in Vietnam. They remember that when they similarly sank into the *doronomia* of a guerrilla war against nationalistic inspired Chinese, the only road out led through total war and total defeat for Japan.

The metaphor is not an unfamiliar one in this country. We are bogged down in a seem-

ingly endless and increasingly hopeless "dirty" war. In our frenzy to keep our heads above the engulfing muck, we have given little thought to where we should be trying to go, not just in Vietnam, but in Asia as a whole. Ostensibly we are still on the same course that led us into the Vietnamese swamp. But to continue in this direction will only compound our difficulties. On this point, I suspect that there is a growing, though unarticulated, consensus among hawks, doves, owls and the rest of us poor sparrows.

We seem to have lost our bearings and until we find them we can have little hope for a better future in our relationship with Asia. We must discover where there is firmer ground on which to stand and then head resolutely in that direction. Unless we do so, we may not find any way out of the Vietnamese *doronomy*, or, still worse, the route we choose, as in Japan's case, may lead to an even greater morass.

In recent weeks three widely separated and quite dissimilar events have underlined our need to take a broader look at our Asian problems. I am referring to the Vietcong attack on the cities of South Vietnam, the Pueblo incident off North Korea and London's announcement of the withdrawal of all British forces from east of Suez by 1971. All three were adverse to our immediate interests, but if they help us to lift our eyes from Vietnam to the larger problems, they could, in the long term, prove blessings in disguise.

It may still be too early to judge the full significance of the new stage of the war in Vietnam, but it seems probable that the psychological effects will outweigh the military. It may be, as some argue, that the increased intensity of the war and the heightened hopes of the Vietcong will make it difficult for them to subside back into a more passive, long-range, guerrilla strategy. In that sense, their options may have been reduced to fairly early and complete victory or a compromise settlement. It is even more likely that the drastic decline in the well-being and security of the urban population of South Vietnam has greatly diminished the chances that any Saigon regime can establish an effective government in the South as long as the fighting continues.

The psychological impact on Americans also has been heavy. Many have come to see what has been obvious for a long time to the more perceptive—that this is a war which America cannot really win. At the outset, it seemed possible that the Communist dissidents could be forced to go back underground, where in time, if all went well aboveground, they might wither away. But gradually it has become obvious that the best that could be hoped for was a compromise settlement far short of stated American objectives and dangerously susceptible to an eventual Communist take-over. Even this hope is now dimming, and there is a growing possibility that in the end the United States will be forced by the apathy of the Vietnamese and the incompetence of the Saigon leaders to settle for as dignified an exit from Vietnam as can be arranged.

But, however the war comes out, it has already been lost in terms of our original objectives. Our basic purpose, as often stated, was to prove that so-called "wars of national liberation" did not pay. The assumption was that, whatever the mix of internal revolution, external instigation and open aggression in Vietnam, a determined stand on our part could suppress it and would thus discourage the repetition of the story elsewhere.

Instead we have proved quite clearly to ourselves and everyone else that we cannot win a war like the one in Vietnam—at least at a price that would make the effort worthwhile. Vietnam has made it much more dubious than it was before that we would intervene strongly in a similar situation elsewhere in Asia and unthinkable that we would do so while the Vietnam war lasted. The

SEATO approach to the problems of Asia has been proved a failure. In other words, we are coming to the end of a policy.

Some Americans find it hard to accept this fact because they believe it can only mean disaster for Asia—and eventually the world. Assuming the failure of our thumb-in-the-dike operation in Vietnam, they expect the Communist wave to sweep over all of Asia. But is this correct? New "wars of national liberation" have not broken out, except for a small-scale insurgency in northeast Thailand which, while possibly in part a spill-over from the Vietnam war, is largely the product of local conditions. Smoldering Communist insurgencies have not flared up, except in the Philippines, where purely local misrule has given new life to old embers. Elsewhere in Asia, there has been no response to our failure in Vietnam. In fact, in Indonesia a powerful Communist movement has been crushed by nationalistic forces during these same years.

Basically, the success or failure of Communist movements in Asia is determined by internal conditions. With the one exception of North Korea, which was established in 1945 by Soviet military power, Communist movements in Asia have depended almost exclusively on internal forces and, where successful, have been carried along by nationalistic tides. In short, nationalism everywhere has proved to be a greater power than any other ideology or any external pressure.

Our concept of Communism as a great wave threatening to sweep over the dike we were desperately trying to build in Asia is quite false. Communism might be better compared to local ground water, and in most cases—one could cite Indonesia, Burma, Cambodia, India and many other countries—this ground water has not succeeded in undermining the local political structures. What we have been trying to do in Asia thus may be largely unnecessary—as well as impossible. Asian states do not need military dikes so much as good economic land fill.

The outstanding fact about the second event, the North Korean seizure of the *Pueblo*, is that the Administration's response was very sensible and cautious, and the cries of the hawks were surprisingly muted. Perhaps the lessons of Vietnam are not being lost on Americans.

But the *Pueblo* incident also has its own lesson. It shows once again that many Asians are not prepared to live by the rules of the game of international relations devised in the West. Even the Soviets have observed most of the rules and have tacitly developed new ones with us. The Chinese Communists and the North Koreans have repeatedly shown that they have only contempt for these Western rules. Other non-Western nations—and even some, like Cuba, which are part of Western culture—have done the same.

This is a fact of life that we must recognize. Lacking the means to force the rules on these countries at a price that would be worth the effort, we have to learn to live with the situation. This means a further limitation on the scope of our actions in Asia. The recent example showed that, while an unprotected American intelligence ship can safely operate 12 miles off a Soviet coast, just as their intelligence ships operate safely even closer to our ports and naval vessels, similar operations along the coasts of a country like North Korea can be undertaken only if we are prepared to provide strong defense support or run high risks. This is, of course, only a small and very specialized case, but it is illustrative of a broad category of military, diplomatic, economic and cultural activities in which our freedom of action toward Asian nations is severely limited by their refusal to accept our rules.

At this time when Americans are disturbed by the *Pueblo* incident and dazed by the blow-up in the Vietnamese cities, the

British announcement of complete withdrawal from Asia comes as a further blow. Painfully aware at last of the limitations of our power in Asia, we are appalled by the thought that the power vacuum in the Indian Ocean left by Britain's departure may have to be filled by us. To attempt to do so might stretch our power so thin and so overburden our economy and psyche that we collapse, as the Communists hopefully predict. Or, recoiling at the magnitude of the problems in Asia, we might decide to withdraw into "fortress America," psychologically and literally, leaving the rest of the world to stew in its own juices.

Either of these developments would be an unmitigated disaster for us and the whole world. Unfortunately, neither can be regarded as altogether unlikely in our present state of frenzied preoccupation with Vietnam and disregard of the bigger problems in our relations with Asia. Let us hope that these three successive shocks will, like cold water in the face, help us to clear our befuddled minds so that we can get our bearings in time.

We might start by examining the meaning of Britain's withdrawal. London has already taken its force of 10,000 men out of Aden and by the end of 1971 will have withdrawn a similar force from the Persian Gulf and more than 50,000 men from Singapore and Malaysia, closing down the great Singapore naval base. All that will remain of Britain's once predominant military power east of Suez will be a small internal security force of 6,000 Gurkhas in Hong Kong.

Will this British withdrawal result, as is so often predicted, in the creation of a power vacuum in the Indian Ocean? Only in a very relative sense. Seventy thousand men supported by only minor naval and air power constitute little real military strength in a huge area like the Indian Ocean, flanked by nations, from Indonesia through India and the Middle East to West Africa, with an aggregate population of around 900 million.

Twice British troops have helped quell violence in the tiny island of Mauritius—a task which even the United Nations might have been able to accomplish. One might argue that the absence of serious trouble in the oil-rich Persian Gulf, despite the general backwardness of the area and the survival of medieval sheikdoms on the southern shore can be attributed in part to the British presence. United Kingdom forces played a role in avoiding conflicts in certain former British territories, such as Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda and Kuwait. They also helped contain the Indonesian confrontation with Malaysia, though Indonesia's own pathetic weakness and the presence of the American Seventh Fleet in the South China Sea were probably more important factors.

When it comes to the larger tasks, however, it is hard to see how the vestigial British presence in the Indian Ocean has made much difference. Certainly, forces of this size could not have suppressed any determined subversive movement in one of the larger countries. The British troops in Aden were not able to maintain tolerable levels of law and order even in that lightly populated area. The British presence had no great influence on the fighting between Pakistan and India. If Soviet aggressiveness needed deterrence in the Indian Ocean, this obviously was provided by factors other than the 70,000 British troops scattered around the area. If any external forces helped discourage Communist China from renewing its attack on India or invading Burma, it was the possibility of American intervention, not the presence of a thousand or more miles away of a handful of British soldiers.

In terms of major military forces, the Indian Ocean and the lands around its shores have constituted a power vacuum for some time. The withdrawing of the last few cubic centimeters of external military strength will not greatly change the situation, except

psychologically for Americans. We see ourselves standing all the more alone in our effort to preserve through military strength a stable and peaceful world.

It is a good time to ask ourselves some searching questions. The first might be: If the Indian Ocean area has managed to stay tolerably stable within a near power vacuum, may it not continue to do so in a complete power vacuum? Perhaps the rickety political and social structures of the region can stand more successfully without our heavy-booted military tread on their flimsy floors. Moreover, past experience elsewhere would suggest that the people of the area might be more likely to address themselves with success to renewing or repairing their political and social structures, if we were not so eager to mastermind the task for them. We should have learned enough from Vietnam to see how dangerous and futile it would be for us to undertake similar involvements even farther afield.

A broader question might be: What risks would we be taking in failing to replace the British in the Indian Ocean and how acceptable would these risks be? It would be foolishly complacent to assume that there would be no increase in the possibility of disturbances. Nor, in a rapidly evolving situation, could we presume that the past level of stability guaranteed the continuance of an equal level of stability in the future. There would obviously be risks, but it would seem safer to accept these than to try to counter them by an approach which has already proved hazardous and ineffective elsewhere. This is particularly true because in the whole Indian Ocean area the United States has few, if any, immediate national interests at stake.

The only great danger to us—and it would be a danger only over the long run—would be the establishment, by either the Soviet Union or China, of such effective control over large parts of this area that the dominating country greatly increased its own national power. But is this a real danger? Is it not merely a bad nightmare produced by our traumatic experiences in the early postwar years? If either the Chinese or Russians were such supermen that they could accomplish this sort of control in Asia despite the staggering obstacles of poverty, backwardness and violent nationalism, we mere mortals obviously could not compete with them anyway, and might as well make obscurity ourselves.

A more realistic American concern in this region—again in the long run—is its development in prosperity and stability as a healthy part of our shrinking globe. Increased warfare and internal stability would obviously disrupt this desirable development. If American involvement could eliminate these dangers, it would be a worthwhile effort to make, but the Vietnam example suggests that our efforts, far from stopping such disruptions, would be likely to make them even more destructive. And again the Vietnam example shows that our own involvement in attempting to keep the peace by military means sharply reduces our ability—or at least our willingness—to make contributions in the economic and technological fields, which in the long run are far more effective ways than military action to develop prosperity and stability.

It is also hard to see where specific, short-range American interests are much involved. The blocking of the Straits of Malacca would force the Japanese to make a big detour in their life line to their vital oil resources and some of their important markets. For the same reason, Suez is of particular interest to Europe, though the increasing size of tankers and falling costs of long-distance water transportation make even a reopened Suez of declining importance.

But the sea lanes through the area do not lead us anywhere. The resources and trade of the whole Indian Ocean region are not vital to the United States, and therefore their

denial through local warfare or internal instability would not seriously affect us. The impact on the Japanese economy would be much more serious, and even Western Europe would be discomfited, but not the United States.

Even for Japan and Western Europe it is only the oil of the Persian Gulf that is vitally important. The denial of this oil to the outside world, because of piracy, revolution or war, would entail financial losses to certain American companies, but these losses would be inconsequential compared with the costs to our nation of Vietnam-type military involvement. On the other hand, the Japanese economy might face disaster, and Europe would be sorely hurt. Close to a half of the energy resources on which the Japanese economy operates consist of Persian Gulf oil, while half of Europe's petroleum comes from the Middle Eastern area.

This situation suggests another fundamental question we should ponder: Why do Japanese and Western Europeans, who have very clear national interests at stake in the Indian Ocean area, look with equanimity—one might say complacency—on the prospects there, while Americans, who have no clear national interests at stake, feel that they face an agonizing decision? This paradox perhaps best illustrates what is basically wrong in our relationship with Asia.

World War II, from which we alone among the larger, advanced nations emerged relatively unscathed, left us widely extended around the world and burdened with heavy responsibilities. Our response to this challenge was on the whole wise and generous. But the abnormal postwar situation created in us habits of mind and response which have proved increasingly unsound. We have commonly exaggerated our immediate interests in Asia, the risk these interests faced, and our capacity to deal with them. As a consequence, we have tended to overreact.

Seeing us respond in this way, other countries, such as Japan and those of Western Europe, which have much greater interests in Asia and face far greater risks, have increasingly come to expect that in any situation the United States would do all that reasonably could be done—and very possibly more than was reasonable. Both we and they, thus, have come to assume that the United States unilaterally would undertake the responsibility for maintaining stability in Asia—and elsewhere throughout the world. The *Pax Britannica* of the 19th century was apparently being replaced by a *Pax Americana*.

The analogy is extremely misleading. This is no longer the 19th century. We live in a far more heavily populated, complex, highly integrated and power-crammed world. The explosive forces are far greater and the need for peace and stability far more urgent. The thin, selective system of the *Pax Britannica* would be entirely inadequate for the present situation. A guarantee of peace by a single nation—any nation—is even less realistic. In this age of intense national feelings, such an approach is doomed to failure. It breeds resistance among friends as well as foes.

Japan offers a good case in point. We have already seen that its national interests are far more deeply involved than are our own in the stability of the Indian Ocean area—particularly the Persian Gulf and the Straits of Malacca. The same is, of course, true of our comparative national interests in the stability of East and Southeast Asia. The countries of the area constitute important trading partners for Japan, but not for us—with the exception of Japan itself. The safety of the sea lanes that lead to Japan are a matter of life and death to the Japanese economy. A general collapse of peace in East Asia could drag Japan down, too.

Given this situation, it would be comical, if it were not so tragic, that most Japanese regard matters of defense and stability in East Asia as being peculiarly American prob-

lems, not Japanese. They feel that what is involved is American pride and an evil ambition to dominate the world. While valuing close contacts with the United States, with which Japan does about 30 per cent of its total trade, many Japanese fear too close an association. They regard American bases in Japan, not so much as valuable to Japan for the security and stability they provide to much of East Asia, but as detrimental to Japanese interests, because they might involve Japan in an American war with China.

In other words, Japanese have come to take for granted the benefits of the American presence and therefore tend to think only about the possible liabilities. They seem to assume that a senseless, driving ambition would keep the United States militarily involved in East Asia even without Japan's cooperation or the convenience of Japanese bases. It never occurs to them to worry about what might happen in their part of the world if the United States decided to draw back to mid-Pacific. Thus, the only problem that looms in their minds is the danger of Japanese involvement in an American war in East Asia, and the best way to diminish this risk seems to them to be to get rid of the American bases in Japan and the Japanese-American security treaty.

This, of course, is not the attitude of the Japanese Government and some of those who vote for it. I say only "some," because the governing party's electoral strength is based more on domestic issues than on foreign policy. In the early years of this decade, there were signs that an increasing proportion of the Japanese were beginning to see their security interests in a more realistic way and were thus coming to value the American presence in East Asia. But the growing intensity of the Vietnam war during the past three years has smothered this healthy trend, and once again the chief concern in Japanese minds is the threat to Japan of the American alliance, not the dangers to Japan of an unstable East Asia.

The Japanese case is an extreme one, growing out of a special psychological situation produced by the catastrophe of the Second World War. But many European reactions are not dissimilar. And people in the less developed countries, though the most seriously threatened by instability and war in their parts of the world, are often the least able to see beyond the looming American presence to the real problem. The greatest tragedy about our well-meaning but sometimes frenetic efforts to bring stability to Asia is that they have stood in the way of a realistic understanding of the problems in other countries and thus have inhibited the development of an effective international response, which in the long run can be the only successful answer.

I am not proposing that we should try to transfer the responsibilities for stability in Asia to the Japanese. They would not and could not bear the load. Nor am I suggesting that responsibilities should be apportioned according to national interests, because this would put the heaviest burden on those least able to bear it. Nor am I wistfully hoping that the United Nations will suddenly rise phoenixlike to meet the need.

The United States will obviously have to continue to bear the major share of the load for stability and development in the less developed parts of the world—simply because, as the richest and strongest nation, we can most easily carry this heavy burden. But we should no longer try to do it alone, nor should the task be seen by us and others as a specifically American undertaking in response to a specifically American policy. Such an approach inevitably is self-defeating.

The Indian Ocean area would be a good place in which to start this more modest and more relaxed approach. This is simply because our present commitments there are minimal, and so we can start with a relatively clean slate. We are in a position to wait

and see if the British withdrawal does result in a deterioration of the situation. If it does, we can safely wait until those whose interests are more immediately involved decide to develop, with our full cooperation, of course, an international approach to the problem. If this produces a broadly based international effort, we need have no fears about our own participation, even on a large scale.

It would be premature to guess what shape such an international effort might take, but we can speculate about some of its possible elements. A mobile force might be created to fulfill at least the limited functions the British forces have been performing in the Indian Ocean area, and possibly in time considerably more. A central element of such a force would probably be a fleet comparable in function to our Seventh Fleet in the Western Pacific. Most of this fleet might be American, and, in fact, it might in large part be our Seventh Fleet with additional bases that would permit it to operate, as needed, in the Indian Ocean. For this purpose, it might be best based on the Singapore naval base, of course at the invitation of Singapore and with the approval of Malaysia and probably also Indonesia. It might also have subsidiary bases elsewhere in the Indian Ocean on the invitation of other nations.

It would be important, however, to have not just the bases but also some of the naval units and supporting land and air units provided by other countries besides the United States—those of the area first of all, but also interested outsiders, such as the European countries, Australia and even Japan in time. The Japanese already show some interest in giving support to United Nations peace-keeping activities. In time, they may be ready to take part in other international peace-keeping efforts. If these appear to be clearly in Japan's interests.

More important than the international composition of an Indian Ocean force would be the international character of its objectives. It must be clearly an instrument of international interests, not American. This should be acceptable to the United States, since our objectives in the Indian Ocean area are not narrow national ones but only broad concerns of international stability.

The primary task of the force presumably would be to maintain, as a common international interest, the safety of all on the high seas and on the routes of international commerce. Beyond that, it might seek to give to the area what stability it could at a reasonable cost. In limited crises and in smaller areas, it could play the stabilizing role the British forces have in the past.

The presence of a base structure and some power-in-being would also give the cooperating nations the option to attempt to stop blatant aggression if it occurred. A Korea-type war seems unlikely in the area, but the nations whose interests might be affected if one did occur would at least have the option to intervene if they felt it worthwhile. The very fact that such an option existed would probably go a long way toward deterring a would-be aggressor.

On the other hand, there would be no commitments to the internal stability of any country. Massive intervention in internal disorders, especially in larger countries, would be folly, as our Vietnam experience has clearly shown. The whole history of postwar Asia also suggests that the forces of nationalism are so strong that there is little danger of successful domination of any major national unit from outside. Each country can be safely left to work out its own national destiny. In so far as its stability and development are matters of concern to other nations, the latter can contribute to these ends far better by providing economic and technological assistance and an external environment of stability than by intervening militarily in internal disorders.

The above is a far more specific blueprint than can safely be drawn at this time of doubt about the future. But I have elaborated it to show the general nature of a new approach to our relationship with Asia.

On the one hand, it would be something far more than the SEATO approach, in that it would be truly international in origin, organization and objectives, rather than a thinly disguised American military commitment to individual Asian countries, based on an American concept of stopping the spread of a monolithic Communist movement. On the other hand, it would be much less than the SEATO approach, in that its objectives and commitments would be far more limited, avoiding self-defeating military involvement in maintaining internal stability, and concentrating instead on the real international and American interests, which lie in the maintenance of the freedom of the seas and a general international framework of peace and stability. Equally important, it would reduce the military aspect of our involvement in Asia to a minor supporting role for our far more productive involvement in economic and technological assistance.

While the field is clear for the application of this sort of new approach to the Indian Ocean area, it would take more time and effort to apply it to areas like East and Southeast Asia, where the United States is already deeply involved in a variety of commitments based on the older approach and where specific American interests loom larger than they do in the Indian Ocean. The pattern of the American relationship with these other areas will naturally remain more diverse.

Since Japan is a stable, modernized nation, is our greatest trading partner next to Canada, and contains the bulk of Asia's industrial (and therefore military) power, its defense is a vital interest to us. Moreover, its defense can be safely guaranteed by us, because internal instability and subversion are not problems there. A defense alliance with Japan thus is as sound, one might say inevitable, as with the United Kingdom or Australia. I assume, therefore, that the mutual security treaty with Japan will be maintained and, if possible, strengthened.

Our formal commitments to South Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines will also probably remain. There is a long history behind each of these, and fortunately geography makes it more practicable for us to live up to them than would be the case in most other parts of Asia. Taiwan and the Philippines are islands, and there is no substantial threat to our naval supremacy in the Western Pacific. South Korea, although a peninsula, makes up for its northern land border by a great firmness of will and a relatively high level of political and economic development.

In Southeast Asia we face a more complex situation. Burma and Cambodia offer no problem, since they are opposed to commitments of any sort from us, feeling that a policy of complete neutrality gives them better security. Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia are in a more ambiguous position and, as I have indicated, might best be considered in the same category as the Indian Ocean area.

Our chief problem centers around Laos and Thailand. Regardless of the outcome in Vietnam, it seems probable that the Vietnamese, a far more numerous, energetic and better organized people than their Laotian neighbors, will in the long run dominate, in one way or another, that small, backward, landlocked country made up of 2.5 million poverty-stricken people divided into diverse ethnic groups. It seems doubtful to me that either the United States or an international body can guarantee to Laos true independence, much less internal stability.

In Thailand, we find a relatively large, prosperous and contented nation, and the only country in Southeast Asia that has managed to maintain its independence

throughout modern times. Despite the small-scale subversive movements in the poor northeast and the even more dangerous overburdening of the country's economy and psychology by a large American military presence, Thailand is not likely to go the way of South Vietnam. Still, a unilateral American commitment to Thailand is not best for us or for the Thais, and this is what we have, in disguised form, through SEATO and, more directly, through our military presence resulting from the use of bases in Thailand to prosecute the war in Vietnam. If Thailand should suffer open aggression (which is unlikely), it would be better for us if the response were international rather than merely American. If Thailand were to be disrupted by Vietnam-style internal subversion, again it would be better for it and for us if we did not become militarily involved.

We cannot, of course, just repudiate the commitments we have made to Thailand. There first must be developed viable regional or international alternatives. In the last few years, several hopeful beginnings in regional organizations have appeared in Southeast Asia, some embracing countries as far afield as Japan and Australia. These regional groupings will probably contribute to economic cooperation and development throughout the area. They may also contribute in a small way to the security of the countries concerned, by developing mutual awareness of one another and thus a broader international concern over the security of each. But these regional organizations are not likely to develop into useful military alliances. The component units, for the most part, are too unstable and militarily too weak.

Broader international commitments would probably be a more realistic substitute than regional ones for unilateral American guarantees to Thailand. In time, the more-than-SEATO approach in international participation and the less-than-SEATO approach in objectives and commitments that I have outlined for the Indian Ocean area could probably be made to apply to Thailand also, and to the rest of Southeast Asia.

Would this, however, be adequate if we envision as a possible outcome in Vietnam the withdrawal of American forces and the eventual unification of the South with the North? Would not the victorious Vietnamese Communists, if not the Chinese, move on then to indirect aggression against Thailand, by stirring up and fueling from outside a successful Communist revolution? This seems to me doubtful. Whatever the outcome in Vietnam, the Vietnamese will probably find that the reconstruction of their own devastated land fully absorbs their energies, and an effort to overthrow other countries will seem to them a less pressing and less rewarding task.

Beyond that, Thailand and South Vietnam are not parallel cases. North and South Vietnam basically form a single country. The Communist revolution had had a long and particularly successful history in the South as well as the North before the division took place. And the fighting in the South was for years carried on only by Southerners, and still is for the most part in their hands. In all these regards, the situation is very different in Thailand. The Vietnamese are hated foreigners to them, and if Thailand were indeed so weak a political unit that it could be overthrown by intrigues fomented and fed by such foreigners, it obviously could not be defended by anyone.

One cannot deny that the still unknown outcome of the war in Vietnam leaves many looming dangers. A new approach to our relationship with Asia, such as I have outlined above, would also run a number of other risks. Would other nations realize in time that they had vital interests in the stability of Asia and make the necessary contributions to an international approach to the problem? Could enough agreement be reached among the

countries concerned to provide an adequate response? Would the threat of indirect aggression through subversion be adequately met by the forces of nationalism? Could the difficult transition from America's go-it-alone approach to a real international effort be made safely? Would we Americans be capable of disengaging ourselves sufficiently to permit the development of an international approach, without swinging back too far into an isolationism which would destroy the whole effort? All these are very real dangers. But taken together they constitute less of a risk than to continue blindly along what has proved to be an impossible course.

[From Life Magazine, Mar. 15, 1968]

VIETNAM: LET'S NOT HAVE MORE OF THE SAME

President Johnson faces an excruciating decision about Vietnam. The immediate question before him last week was whether to grant General Westmoreland's request for another 100,000 or 200,000 troops to meet the new military situation brought about by General Giap's big Tet offensive. But this is just part of a larger decision, for the character of the Vietnam war has changed radically.

We are close to the point where the calling up of the Guard or the Reserves, and the possibility of controls, would put new strains on our manpower and economic resources, and indeed on the American political fabric.

Even after six weeks, the full consequences of the Tet offensive are still under study at the White House, producing alternate bursts of hope and gloom, sobriety and wishful thinking. The trapped and dug-in mood of Washington's policymakers is one of the most depressing aspects of the situation. "Everyone is out of bright ideas," says one of them. In Saigon the government, whose overthrow was one of Giap's chief objectives, has at least survived. Its army acquitted itself well during the worst of the Tet fighting and is mostly intact. But the problems now facing the Thieu-Ky government are staggering—over 600,000 new refugees, miles of city rubble, a stunned economy, shattered communications and pervasive fear in the cities as well as in the countryside.

At this climactic point in the Vietnamese war, there are perhaps five courses open to U.S. policy. They are these:

Severe Escalation. The extreme hawks would not just send more troops but add new bomb targets (Haiphong harbor) and new battlefields (such as invading Laos or North Vietnam). A few even talk recklessly of using tactical nuclear weapons. The risks of a new world war in such major escalations range from unacceptable to outrageous.

More of the Same. The U.S. could support Westmoreland's present strategy—a war of attrition—with as much manpower as he needs for as long as it takes to defeat the Communist forces in the field. This might mean years.

One More Try. Or the U.S. could pursue "more of the same" but not indefinitely. We might launch major offensive operations of our own with the hope (but obviously no announcement) that one big effort could end the war soon. Looking back over the past few years, the President sometimes thinks he should have applied more massive force sooner. As General Gavin says, a limited war should be limited in time as well as in space.

Change of Strategy. The U.S. could re-examine the strategy of attrition, the war of body counts. Instead of seeking out Giap's main-force units, we could put more emphasis on clearing and holding the populated areas, on pacification and on uprooting the V.C. infrastructure (LIFE Editorials, Jan. 5 and 12). Many dedicated missions, military as well as civilian, have worked hard at these very things, but this side of the war has never been given overriding priority.

Withdrawal. The U.S. could start pulling out with whatever dignity we can muster

on whatever terms we can get, taking what comfort we could in Walter Lippmann's argument that this need not be a U.S. military "defeat" but rather an acknowledgment of a costly policy mistake. Cold comfort for Saigon.

Of these five alternatives the first and fifth are unnecessarily desperate.

The other three provide a reasonable frame for argument. At the Tuesday luncheons, where the President sets war policy with Rusk, Rostow and now with new Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, most of the talk is believed to favor the "More of the Same" alternative, i.e., more troops in support of the same old war of attrition. We consider this a bad choice.

There are too many gaps in any journalist's information—including the imminent possibility of new offensives—to say flatly that Westmoreland should not have more men. If the sole purpose of sending more men is to enable Westmoreland to continue what he has been doing, we are opposed. In some ways, more "white faces" in a land that already sees too many of them will make our problem worse. Even if Westmoreland recovers his mobility, it is a Red Queen kind of progress—back to where we were before Jan. 30. And Giap can send in more troops, too. The attrition strategy reminds some Westmoreland critics of "the Haig syndrome"—named after the bulldozing British marshal of World War I—"Give me another 100,000 men, Sir, and I can assure you we will have finished the job by Christmas." Except that Westmoreland makes no such promises these days.

It is time to reassess our strategy in Vietnam. It has been based, we believe, on an error expressed by General Wheeler in 1962, an error which still governs too much official thinking: "The essence of the problem in Vietnam is military." On the contrary, the essence of the problem is political. As General Wheeler and others would agree, the true goal and purpose of our presence in Vietnam is to leave behind a viable self-governing country, and its military dimension is the physical security of the South Vietnamese people. The momentum of military responses has diverted us too far from this goal.

Redirecting ourselves to the goal means de-escalating our war with the North Vietnamese. It means avoiding pitched battles with their main-force units in underpopulated wilderness like Khesanh and concentrating on the closer defense of South Vietnam population centers, even though this may involve abandoning considerable real estate. It means shifting the emphasis of American participation from combat to the more intensive training and equipping of South Vietnamese forces; and if more men are needed, the South Vietnamese (who are at last drafting their 19-year-olds) should supply them. Instead of widening the war's perimeter, we should even reduce it for the sake of better security where most of the people live.

The strategic bombing of North Vietnam, beyond the rear of the battleground, should be halted. Its military effectiveness has long been questionable anyway. A bombing halt would be the most audible invitation to reciprocal de-escalation on Hanoi's part. It is also the quickest way to learn what Hanoi means by "negotiations," which U Thant now assures us we could begin in days. A lot of Americans, as well as the rest of the world, would feel better if, before making any new troop commitments, we had made a more convincing effort to negotiate. One way to test Communist intentions would be to determine how ready they are in negotiations to move to a complete cease-fire on the battlefield.

Another reason for favoring some de-escalation is the political effect on the Thieu-Ky regime, which has yet to shape up as the focus of South Vietnamese hopes and loyal-

ties. Giap's attack on the cities did not generate mass conversions to the V.C. side, but neither did the war-weary population rally further to the government. The government needs to widen its political base instead of nervously jailing its opposition. The future of South Vietnam is, at this juncture, greatly dependent on the behavior of its own leaders. We cannot pass a miracle and turn South Vietnam overnight into a brave democracy, but we can avoid the blunder of protracting its dependence on U.S. arms or becoming ourselves the captives of its policies.

In recent weeks we have been given a hard lesson in how not to fight this war; we have not lost all chance of bringing it to an acceptable conclusion.

COAL UNION'S ANTINUCLEAR CAMPAIGN BACKFIRES—AND BACKFIRES AGAIN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it may be recalled that no long ago I had occasion to invite the attention of my colleagues to a campaign by certain coal interests to denigrate the civilian nuclear power industry. At that time I referred to the terror tactics being employed by President W. A. "Tony" Boyle, of the United Mine Workers, in his antinuclear campaign, and predicted that the coal industry and the miners—not the nuclear industry—would be the losers. Judging from recent press accounts, it appears that my prediction is being borne out even sooner than anticipated.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I will include an article from the March 7, 1968, edition of the Washington Daily News, by Staff Writer Stanley Levey, in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article, headlined "UMW Split on Use of Atomic Energy," reports that Mr. Boyle recently felt obliged to expel District 50 from the United Mine Workers because its members had the temerity to adopt a resolution recognizing that there is room for development of all forms of energy—coal, oil, gas, and—heaven forbid—nuclear.

Mr. Boyle likens the action of District 50 to that of a "thankless child"—a child which, incidentally, has grown to be twice the size of the enraged parent. In a perhaps more apt analogy, staff writer Levey likens Mr. Boyle's campaign to King Canute's unsuccessful efforts to hold back the sea.

Some of these same coal interests may be interested to learn that their campaign to uninvent the peaceful uses of the atom is backfiring on other fronts.

Recently they approached the publisher of a leading Baltimore, Md., newspaper to draw his attention to the alleged dangers of nuclear power and to urge that his newspaper—the Baltimore News American—publish "the facts" in this regard. In contacting a publisher in Baltimore, I am sure these coal union spokesmen were not unmindful of the proposal of the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. to build two large nuclear powerplants down the coast from Baltimore on the Chesapeake Bay.

The publisher assigned his science writer, Mohammed Rauf, Jr., to the

story. In the best tradition of impartial journalism, Mr. Rauf investigated both sides of the issue before writing his piece and, as requested by the coal interest, did indeed publish "the facts."

Mr. Rauf's article is an objective and balanced treatment of the issues involved. His characterization of the UMW efforts is comparable to Mr. Levey's. Mr. Rauf compares the bitter struggle of the UMW to the fruitless fight of the stagecoach against the "iron horse," and finds that both had one thing in common: "the opposition of vested interests to scientific progress and a better way of doing things." I commend Mr. Rauf's article to the reading of my colleagues and anyone else who may be interested, and include it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

To avoid any confusion that might otherwise arise in the minds of some I should clarify for the record the fact that the trade union official referred to in Mr. Rauf's article as "atomic energy's most implacable foe" is indeed none other than the gentleman who on a number of occasions in the past reproached the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy because it was not pushing the development of nuclear reactors as vigorously as he would have liked.

I especially recall this gentleman's appearance before the Joint Committee in 1960, when he urged that modern production-line techniques be used to turn out 1,000 reactors for early distribution in this country and abroad. At that time he regretted to see "the coal industry filibustering progress in atomic energy." He said:

I am hopeful, that those in the coal industry who fear progress in atomic energy will come to realize that they are mistaken.

For whatever it is worth I suppose I should also point out that the individual involved has since that time changed his affiliation from one trade union to another.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 7, 1968]

UMW SPLIT ON USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY—PARENT UNION BITTER AT DISTRICT 50 IN POLICY FIGHT

(By Stanley Levey)

Like King Canute who tried unsuccessfully to hold back the sea, the United Mine Workers of America is attempting to halt the peaceful use of atomic energy.

And this undertaking has brought the union into bitter conflict with its own creation and affiliate—District 50, which thinks atomic energy is here to stay.

The UMW sees further loss of job opportunities for its 125,000 coal miners if the atom replaces coal to fuel power plants and big industrial installations.

Ironically, while the parent UMW has shrunk in size over the years, the catch-all District 50, with thousands of workers in the chemical and atomic energy industries, now has 225,000 members.

IRONIC

A further irony is that the UMW was one of the first labor groups in the country to accept the realities of automation.

The dispute between the UMW and District 50 was triggered by the latter's recent adoption of a resolution linking its future with the progress and development of the atomic energy industry. Yesterday, the dispute be-

came critical (the word used by atomic physicists to describe the point preceding a nuclear explosion).

POUND TABLE

Pounding the table in the UMW board room, W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president, ordered District 50 expelled after 30 days. And he served notice on the "thankless child," as he termed the affiliate, that it must also drop the name "District 50, United Mine Workers of America."

A few minutes later, half a block away in another UMW building which District 50 rents from the parent union for \$4050 a month, Elwood Moffett, the president and a coal miner and son of a coal miner, quietly observed that while there wasn't much he intended to do about expulsion, he would fight the order to drop the name.

"We don't intend to quarrel with the UMW," he said softly, "after all the UMW under John L. created district 50. . . . We'll go along doing what we've been doing."

What the District has been doing is signing up any kind of worker it could. At various times, the union has had as members taxi drivers, basketball referees, construction workers, public utility workers and the clerical staff of the UMW welfare fund.

QUIT QUARTERS

Mr. Boyle intimidated District 50 would be asked to give up its present quarters. The affiliate has no lease, renting on a month-to-month basis. The prospect of losing about \$225,000 a year in dues from the affiliate did not appear to worry the UMW, one of the richest unions in the world with assets of \$95 million (not including four buildings here and ownership of the National Bank of Washington).

COAL INDUSTRY ASSAILS N-PLANTS AS UNSAFE, COSTLY—FEDERAL SUBSIDIES DEcriED

(By Mohammed Rauf, Jr.)

The stage coach vs. the "iron horse." Coal vs. nuclear power for generating electricity!

The first struggle was fought in the last century. The second is being fought today. Both have one thing in common: the opposition of vested interests to scientific progress and a better way of doing things.

With the increasing use in the country of nuclear energy for generating electricity, the coal industry feels that a day may come when it will be wiped out of business.

To prevent such an eventuality, it is fighting hammer and thongs the spread of nuclear power plants.

Its main contentions:

Nuclear power plants are a serious hazard to human life, because a major accident in a plant can spread damage over a wide area, according to Leo Goodman, a trade union official in Washington, who is nationally recognized as atomic energy's most implacable foe.

Nuclear plants are expensive to build, and are receiving an inordinate amount of federal subsidy. "We can't compete against federal treasury," said Justin McCarthy, editor of The Journal, the official publication of the United Mine Workers Union.

Nuclear plants aren't quite feasible, because the country does not have enough uranium to fuel them, according to Brice O'Brien, counsel for the National Coal Association.

Nuclear plants aren't needed, because American coal mines have enough coal to last a thousand years—a finding confirmed by the Bureau of Mines.

The discharge of treated water from reactors into rivers and seas can wipe out marine life, Goodman said.

Nuclear fatalities and accidents have been too numerous to be ignored, Goodman added.

"The claims made by the Atomic Energy Commission about the safety aspects of nuclear plants are devious and dubious," Good-

man said, "because AEC and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy are in conspiracy to hide the true situation from the public."

This opposition of the coal industry is expressed through an unending succession of public statements, speeches, arguments on Capitol Hill, the publication of hundreds of pamphlets and brochures deriding atomic energy.

The name-calling has become so acrimonious that Cong. Craig Hosmer, member of the Joint Congressional Committee, recently appealed to W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers, to agree to a "cease-fire, because the campaign is helping no one and hurting only the coal industry."

Cong. Hosmer warned: "But if Mr. Boyle wants to continue this fight, I can escalate it right up to the top of coal's ugly, smoke-belching, air-polluting and radiation-spewing smokestacks."

Experts are of the opinion that the growth of nuclear plants will not put coal out of business, because the country's future needs for energy are so fantastic that both coal and nuclear power will be needed to fully meet them.

However, competition from nuclear energy has had two effects on the coal industry:

The coal industry's expansion can hardly be on the scale it would like it to be.

The competition is forcing the industry to keep down the price of coal. One estimate is that this competition has saved the consumer \$1 billion a year for the past 10 years in coal prices.

Coal's opposition to nuclear energy has failed to slow down the construction of reactors. Only in one case has it been able to prevent the building of a reactor. Public reaction in Ravenswood, N.Y., was so strong against reactors that the local power company felt compelled to withdraw its application to build one.

Elsewhere the building of reactors is proceeding at a fast pace. It has become the "in" thing with power companies, because the major builders of electrical generating systems are backlogged with orders for nuclear-fueled systems, which are now in greater demand than conventional fossil-fueled systems.

There are 14 nuclear power plants in operation in the country today, 10 under construction, 31 in the planning stage for which sites have been selected, and 10 in the pre-site planning stage. Their capacity is equal to more than 10 percent of the generating capacity of existing conventional plants.

Proponents of nuclear energy answer coal's charges this way:

A nuclear power reactor is not a bomb, and will not explode like a bomb.

"In a bomb, the nuclear material is almost pure, highly fissionable. In a civilian power reactor the nuclear fuel is always in the form of a chemical compound or alloy totally unsuitable for use in a bomb," said Dr. Joseph Lieberman, assistant director of nuclear safety.

"The charge of federal subsidy is untenable, because not since 1963 has any of the light water reactors ordered by the utilities been federally subsidized," said Sen. John Pastore, another member of Congressional Committee.

The Power Plant scheduled for Denver in the coming years will indeed be federally subsidized to the extent of several million dollars, "but that will be because of its experimental nature," an AEC spokesman said.

"In all our history, the government has been subsidizing up and coming industries," Lieberman said. "It gave the railroads money to extend beyond the Mississippi, it subsidized research on the Supersonic Airplane, and now the federal government alone is carrying out research on the hypersonic airplane, the results of which will be turned over to private industry."

"And, lastly, it must not be overlooked

that plenty of research in coal mining and coal usage is done with federal money."

The shortage of uranium is recognized, but the recent invention of the breeder reactor (a reactor which produces its own fuel) has minimized this need for the foreseeable future.

It is acknowledged that the nation's coal reserves are enough to meet requirements for the next 1,500 years "at the present rate" of consumption, but the smog and pollution problem that will arise with increased use of coal to meet "all" the needs is considered staggering.

"There is no alternative to smog and air pollution but the installation of nuclear plants that don't pollute the atmosphere," Cong. Hosmer stated.

Reactors discharge heated water into the rivers and seas, but the harmful effect this can have on marine life is not fully proved.

"I won't call this discharge thermal pollution, but thermal enrichment, because in many cases the warm water has led to an increase in marine life," Cong. Hosmer said.

Goodman's figures on nuclear fatalities are challenged. It was found that of the 400 fatalities listed by him, only seven were caused by radiation. The others were industrial fatalities, or deaths at foreign nuclear plants.

"Safety requirements for reactors are the most strict of any agency," according to Congressional Committee officials.

They point to the fact that the AEC and its contractors have won the National Safety Council's Award of Honor during four years; the AEC has won the President's Award for Safety Among Federal Employees for the same number of years, and that the AEC's accident rate is one-third of the nation's industrial average over the past 23 years.

"The success of AEC's safety program is nothing short of extraordinary," said Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council. "The records show that the AEC and its centers compare with the safest in all industries."

Chancey Starr, president of Atomic International, put it in a different way: "The safety requirements are so strict, and the chance of an explosion are so remote that they can be likened to a jet plane falling upon the Rose Bowl when a major game is in progress. Certainly, if that happens we would neither give up football nor flying..."

Coal's weakest point, of course, is the air pollution that it causes. And it is generally recognized that the only answer to the problem is the introduction of smoke-free reactors for producing electricity and driving the wheels of industry.

Coal's other weak point is that it produces refuse banks that are not only an eyesore, but portions of which are always on fire. These banks, in some instances, are as much as 800 feet high and a mile long. Not only do they take up a lot of space, but they also cave in, providing additional hazard to life and property.

Concluded Sen. Pastore: "Between now and the year 2000, this nation is going to have to build the equivalent of seven additional power systems of the size that is now serving the American people."

"To meet this tremendous surge we will have need for increasing amounts of all forms of fuels—coal, oil, gas, hydro and nuclear. The suppliers of fossil fuels will be hard-pressed to meet the ever-increasing demands that will be placed upon them."

The conclusion: development of all forms of fuels, according to the Congressional Committee.

THE COMMUNIST CALL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL STUDENT STRIKE: 1968

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

CXIV—441—Part 6

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1967, the House Committee on Un-American Activities released its well-documented and timely report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week, April 8-15, 1967."

This report gave valuable insight into the reasons why a planned nationwide student strike for the spring of 1967 never happened. Extensive planning and organization for the 1967 student strike fell by the wayside when dissident leftist elements withdrew their support in the critical months of organizing. In place of the strike, the Spring Mobilization Committee—now National Mobilization Committee—and the Student Mobilization Committee—SMC—engineered and staged simultaneous demonstrations in New York City and San Francisco on April 15, 1967. A week of campus anti-Vietnam war demonstrations prior to last April 15 was but an ugly prelude to the mass demonstrations on either coast.

At the culmination of Vietnam Week last year, the American citizen was left stunned. Indelibly stamped on his mind were the front page photos of his country's beloved flag being burned in New York City. Other photographs of the demonstration showed an unruly mob waving flags of the Vietcong and raising large portraits of Ho Chi Minh.

Broadcasts of the demonstrations picked out the shrill voices raised in vilification of the American Government and even in denouncement of America's sons in service to their country. On April 15, 1967, demonstrations were clearly staged in defiance of the determination of our people to help resist Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Those hysterical voices which screamed out over loudspeakers in eulogy of the Communist aggressor will not soon be forgotten by any decent American.

What began as a "massive protest demonstration against U.S. Government policy" in Vietnam, was skillfully maneuvered into a carnival of unmistakable support for a Communist victory in Vietnam.

THE ABORTIVE 1967 "STRIKE" PROPOSAL

In the chain of events which led to the ultimate demonstrations last year in New York and San Francisco, the Communist Party—CPUSA—and the Communist-organized and controlled W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America—DCA—were the driving forces behind the plan to hold a nationwide student strike in sympathy with the Vietcong and the Communist North Vietnamese.¹

Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil, daughter of chief CPUSA theoretician, Herbert Aptheker, and herself a dedicated party functionary and CPUSA national committee member, promoted the student strike idea—almost singlehandedly—for

¹ Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week (April 8-15, 1967), Committee on Un-American Activities, March 31, 1967, page 53.

more than a year. Factionalism among the several Communist, splinter, new left and "peace" groups—coupled with a series of individual power plays for the claim of leadership of the proposed student strike movement—proved nearly too much for the newly formed United Front to overcome.

However, a coalition of veteran Communist organizers, "peace" agitators, and special interest promoters, took control of the base of the strike movement and manipulated it into what was to become the notorious Vietnam Week demonstrations which took place throughout the country.²

The Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party—SWP—eventually solidified their hold on the key administrative posts of the spring and students mobilization groups, and according to the leader of a rival Communist organization, the SWP shared this leadership with what they called the revisionist Communist Party, the CPUSA.³

As I reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1967, the Communists had hoped to salvage the plans for a nationwide student strike last year in conjunction with their Vietnam Week activities. Despite extensive efforts toward this end, as many will remember, not one college, university, or high school responded to the Communist call for nationwide student strike.

The student strike idea, as I mentioned, had been vetoed by influential elements within the new left; not because of the comfort the strike would have given the North Vietnamese enemy; not because it had been rightfully found to be morally wrong; but because it was considered that it "was not realistic" at that time.⁴

In the review of why the nationwide student strike was dropped in favor of broad based Vietnam Week demonstrations, we must consider the position and influence of the largest of the new left groups, the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS.

In July of 1966, Bettina Aptheker arranged for her arguments for the student strike to be published and distributed to the SDS National Administration Committee. The SDS-NAC went on record as opposed to the idea, and several position papers on the strike issue were widely distributed to the SDS chapters. SDS consensus was that they had always wound up furnishing "the bodies" but not the leadership for somebody else's demonstration. SDS leaders at the December 1967 Chicago strike conference

² The early organization of the student strike group was under the diversified leadership of the younger members of the SDS, Chicago Peace Council, Committees to End the War in Vietnam, U.S. National Student Association, and other student and "peace" groups which can generally be considered as part of the new left. After the 1967 Chicago Strike Conference, hard core Communist elements emerged from the November 8 Mobilization Committee (Cleveland) and formed the Spring Mobilization Committee. Ibid, pages 33-37.

³ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 113, pt. 9, p. 11963.

⁴ See pages 37-42, Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week, op. cit.

said they felt they were being "used" by the strike organizers. It was also evident that SDS coveted the leadership of the strike movement and when it became apparent that hard core Communist organizers would not even share the leadership with SDS, the leaders of the new left group quietly bowed out. Without the prospect of "bodies" from SDS, the Communists merely shelved the idea for 1 year.

W. E. B. DU BOIS CLUBS (DCA)

Almost to the day, 1 year later, the strike proposal was taken off the shelf by the Communist Party, U.S.A., dusted, and offered again as new merchandise.

On January 6, 1968, the New York area Du Bois Clubs held a meeting to approve the international student strike. The meeting was chaired by CPUSA national committeeman, Robert Heisler, who presented a position paper on the strike from the DCA national committee.

The elements of the DCA position were essentially a rerun of Bettina Aptheker's dream: resurrecting the old Communist-led 1936 student strike which took place during the Oxford pledge days.

Some of us here today are old enough to remember the date, April 22, 1936, when a half million college students had an antiwar strike led by a Communist united front under the auspices of the American Student Union. Thousands of misguided American students about this same time had signed what was termed the "Oxford pledge" which stated in part:

We will support no war undertaken by the U.S. Government.

Oddly enough, most of those students who signed the "pledge" fought and even died for their country when the time came.

The DCA national committee forecast the possibility of getting 10 percent—or approximately 600,000—of this Nation's college students to participate in the 1-day strike as a protest against: the Vietnam war, racism, "imperialism," defense research programs in universities, campus complicity with Armed Forces recruiters, CIA recruiters, and Dow Chemical Co., representatives seeking potential employees from graduating students.

The New York area Du Bois Clubs unanimously resolved to wholeheartedly support Bettina Aptheker's "strike" proposal for the second year in a row.

These same clubs gave approval of: First, working for a broad grouping of delegates to the Chicago strike conference—to include students from all walks of campus society. Second, making the strike a combined student-faculty affair. Third, extending participation in the strike to include even high school

students and teachers. Fourth, setting up a propaganda-literature table at the Chicago strike conference and having it well stocked with partyline propaganda of the Communist Party. Fifth, demanding that the issue of the Vietnam war be fused with the "racial issue" in promoting the international student strike.

MOBILIZATION: IN THE MEANTIME

In its 1 year of existence, the Student Mobilization Committee has asserted itself in the leadership role of "mobilization against the war in Vietnam." The SMC has sent reams of propaganda to its members and potential supporters promoting the October 20 antidraft disturbances in Oakland, Calif., and the October 21 confrontation at the Pentagon. Additionally, the mobilization group proclaimed that it was "coordinating a week of national protest against the draft and the war, December 4-8, 1967."

On May 13 and 14, 1967, the SMC held a strike conference in Chicago which was attended by a claimed 500 to 600. This early conference went almost unnoticed by the public; and in terms of purpose was a complete failure as no decision on the strike was reached.

A December 1967 issue of the Student Mobilizer, official publication of the Student Mobilization Committee, told of initial plans for a possible international student strike for the spring of 1968, and described a planned January 1968 strike conference in Chicago to talk it over.

In early January, the SMC sent a flyer to its mailing list. The flyer was titled "Call to a National Student Antiwar Conference," and in smaller type beneath, "To Discuss an International Student Strike in the Spring."

The conference was set for January 27, 28, and 29, 1968, at the University of Chicago.

In addition to a request for contributions and/or more information on the conference, the SMC described itself in the following words:

The Student Mobilization Committee is the broad coalition of student and youth groups on over 600 campuses which organized Vietnam Week April 8-15, student participation in the October 21st [Pentagon] Confrontation in Washington, and called for Stop the Draft Week, Dec. 4th to 8th.⁵

On January 19, 1968, the SMC sent a letter to all conference participants along with a proposed agenda.

The letter stated that students from 30 States had "written us that they will be present."

The letter added:

Among questions to be discussed are a proposed international student strike, and possible action at the Democratic national convention in August [1968].

James Forman, international secretary and a ranking member on the central committee of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC—and Arthur Kinoy, the attorney who was forcibly ejected from a congressional com-

mittee hearing, were billed as the key speakers for the Chicago conference.⁷ Kinoy was subsequently convicted on a charge of disorderly conduct for his disturbance during hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in August 1966.

THE CHICAGO STRIKE CONFERENCE

The east and west coast Communist Party newspapers, the Worker and People's World, respectively, gave generous coverage to the mobilization conference group.

In its January 2, 1968, issue, People's World stated:

An estimated 1,000 students from over 30 states are scheduled to meet on the University of Chicago campus this weekend.

Members of the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, sponsors of the gathering, say it will be the largest student anti-war conference since the start of U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia.

The 1968 strike conference was to be plagued with diverse organizational and special interest infighting for leadership positions and priority of issues.

SNCC and SDS, while organizationally committed to the student strike issue, were typically undecided as to their tactical approach to the strike at the outset of the Chicago strike conference.

The DuBois Clubs "raised \$1,000 to send a busload of black and Puerto Rican youth to the conference."⁸

People's World also reported that:

Larry Konner of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs said his organization supported the strike.⁹

Of course, the strike was the brainchild of DCA's own Bettina Aptheker in the first place. As an example of understatement, the DCA has had printed and widely distributed a 10-page pamphlet entitled "For a Student Strike—An Immodest Proposal." The DuBois Clubs document covers the arguments for and against an international student strike from A to Z in an attempt to head off any organizational differences which served to kill the strike in April 1967. The DuBois Clubs proposal especially courted the participation of the SDS, and stated:

We believe that the SDS proposal for "Ten Days That Shook The Empire," to be held in April, should be seen as consistent with a Strike and not in opposition to it.

In its preconference coverage, the Worker stated that the strike "backers this time feel that events have made such a strike not only feasible, but desirable" and added:

The international aspect of the strike adds greatly to its value.

And:

Action initiated by U.S. students will be the focus for actions by students all over the world.

On the international aspects of the strike, the Worker continued:

Students in Western Europe, Japan, the socialist countries, and the so-called third world countries are expected to strike their schools the same day.

⁷ Letter and conference agenda dated January 19, 1968 on the letterhead of the Student Mobilization Committee. Letter opens "Dear Friends" and is signed "the staff."

⁸ People's World, January 27, 1968, page 12.

⁹ Ibid.

⁵ The world Communist movement has branded present U.S. foreign policy—particularly in South Korea and South Vietnam—as "imperialistic." In Communist propaganda "imperialism" is a term of opprobrium as applied almost exclusively to the United States. Throughout the free world it is generally accepted that the past and present policy of the U.S.S.R. most historically resembles the definition of "imperialism" in its total domination of the majority of nations under communist rule.

⁶ Undated flyer of the Student Mobilization Committee received in early January, 1968.

In the February 4, 1968 issue of the Worker, the official name of the strike was printed in bold type "Students' Anti-War, Anti-Racist Strike April 26, 1968."

The Communist Party paper went on to give extensive coverage of the strike conference and stated proudly that the attendance was "almost 1,000 students from U.S. colleges and high schools."

The independent Communist weekly newspaper Guardian—formerly National Guardian—of February 10, 1968, noted that there were precisely 679 registrants at the Chicago strike conference, and:

The most disappointing aspect of the conference was its failure to draw significant numbers of new, unaffiliated students.

Prior to the first plenary session of the strike conference a black caucus was formed and officers were chosen. John Wilson, SNCC's antidraft coordinator, was elected chairman of the new "National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union—NBAWADU."

NBAWADU then issued its own call for an international student strike stating:

The 26th day of April [1968] has been set aside . . . as a day for all students throughout the Third World to join the black students of the United States in an International Student Strike.¹⁰

Bettina Aptheker, the CPUSA's top youth agitator, took the podium after the strike proposal was endorsed and proposed an international strike against the Vietnam war, racial oppression, and the draft.

Robert Heisler, aforementioned CPUSA official and education director for the DuBois Clubs, called for the mobilization to aid in defense of the five Texas Southern University students who are being tried for murder of a policeman in connection with the May 16-17, 1967, student riots there.

SDS, whose numbers comprised about one-fifth of the total attendance, felt that their membership could take part in the 1-day student strike as a part of their 10 days to shake the empire campaign, April 21-30, 1968.¹¹

Lawyer Arthur Kinoy addressed the mobilization gathering and verbally painted the false picture of a gigantic wave of repression on the part of the Federal Government aimed at stifling antiwar groups and individuals.

Gwendolyn Patton, formerly southern regional director of the U.S. National Student Association—USNSA—and new NBAWADU national secretary, joined with Linda Morse—nee Dannenberg—to hold a press conference to announce the strike and say that NBAWADU was "laying the groundwork for a power base in the black community to fight against the war, the draft, and U.S. imperialism."¹²

COMMUNIST MOBILIZATION PERSONNEL

The mobilization this year exhibits principally the same individual Communist leadership that masterminded and engineered the Vietnam Week demonstrations of April 8-15, 1967.

Included among the names of those Communists who work openly in the front ranks of the mobilization are: Bettina Aptheker, Phyllis Kalb, Kipp Dawson, and Alex Chernowitz.

Already Bettina Aptheker, a CPUSA official has asserted herself in the role of titular head of the Mobilization.

Phyllis Kalb, publicly identified Communist youth leader, is a national coordinator of the SMC.

Kipp Dawson, who was a prominent leader of the Spring Mobilization Committee last year, is listed as a national coordinator for the student group this year. Miss Dawson is a publicly identified member of the Young Socialist Alliance, youth arm of the Socialist Workers Party.

Alex Chernowitz, one of the mobilization's national coordinators, has been previously identified as chairman of the City College of New York chapter of Youth Against War and Fascism—YAWF—and a member of the editorial staff of Partisan, a YAWF publication. YAWF is the youth affiliate of the Trotskyist-Splinter Workers World Party.

ORGANIZATIONAL PARTICIPATION

Organizations reported to have had representatives present at the Chicago student strike conference, include:¹³

Students for a Democratic Society, which J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, described as working "constantly in furtherance of the aims and objectives of the Communist Party throughout the Nation";

University Christian Movement;

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, whose immediate past chairman has called for the overthrow of the present Government and the start of "the real revolution" in the United States;

Young Socialist Alliance: Youth affiliate of the Socialist Workers Party;

W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America: Communist-organized, Marxist-oriented youth group whose aims and objectives parallel those of the CPUSA;

Youth Against War and Fascism: Youth affiliate of the Trotskyist-splinter Workers World Party;

Southern Student Organizing Committee: The "white counterpart" to SNCC;

Veterans for Peace in Vietnam: A group which has been publicly characterized as a "straight Communist Party operation" and among whose leadership are identified Communist Party members;

Socialist Workers Party: An avowedly Trotskyist Communist group working for the overthrow of the present U.S. Government;

current ideological approach which is being fostered by the recently-formed Tri-Continental Information Center, headquartered in New York City. This center, whose sponsors include identified Communists, sees itself as being founded "to help counteract the role of the U.S. espionage network." The tri-continental comprises the land masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

¹³ The Militant, February 5, 1968, page 1.

Resistance: A radical antidraft organization whose leadership has been known to support Communist objectives;

Communist Party, U.S.A.: A Soviet-directed and Soviet-supported organized Communist movement in the United States;

Committee for Nonviolent Action—(CNVA): A radical "pacifist" organization;

War Resisters League: A pacifist group;

Harlem Black Anti-Draft Union: A New York City-based organization of Negro antidraft agitators; and

Progressive Labor Party: A radical Peking-oriented, Communist-splinter organization which "aggressively and militantly strives to develop followers for its goal, a socialist United States based on Marxist-Leninist principles."

NATIONAL MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

While a certain amount of organizational overlap was in evidence prior to the Vietnam Week demonstrations in April 1967, it is generally accepted throughout the U.S. intelligence community that the Student Mobilization Committee was primarily responsible for coordinating the demonstrations and disruptive activities which took place on the college campuses and at the Federal buildings in several cities throughout the Nation.

The National Mobilization Committee, an organization of older and more experienced "agitators" and special-interest promoters who are very closely allied with the SMC, are credited with the planning and engineering of the April 15, 1967, antiwar, pro-North Vietnam demonstrations in New York City and San Francisco.

The National Mobilization Committee—formerly Spring Mobilization Committee—is headquartered at 5 Beekman Street in New York City and has, in the past, maintained west coast office at 55 Colton Street in San Francisco.

A letterhead bulletin for the National Mobilization Committee—received February 25, 1968, lists its officers, as follows:

Chairman, Dave Dellinger (Dellinger was quoted in a Washington newspaper as admitting to being a Communist—but not of the Soviet variety.)

National Director, Rev. James Bevel (Bevel is a former aide to Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. "on loan" to the mobilization.)

National Coordination, Prof. Robert Greenblatt (a leader of the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy (IUC).)

Co-chairmen: Rev. Ralph Abernathy, Al Evanoff, Prof. Donald Kalish, Sidney Lens, Lincoln Lynch, Prof. Sidney Peck, Rt. Rev. Charles O. Rice, Cleveland Robinson, Dagmar Wilson.

Quoting from the National Mobilization Committee bulletin:

The price for America's arrogance and inhumanity is being paid by the dead and wounded in Vietnam, the poor and oppressed [sic] in our ghettos at home, the children in our congested schools, and the countless others in our society who are being neglected or sacrificed so long as war continues. The total effect of these policies is that we have become a warmaking society.

Opposition and open resistance to the American aggression in Vietnam is growing. It is imperative that this opposition be kept

¹⁰ The Militant, February 5, 1968, page 2.

¹¹ This is a paraphrase of the title of John Reed's book on the Communist revolution in Russia, "Ten Days That Shook the World."

¹² This statement is indicative of the current communist ideology which views the "oppressed" peoples of the free world as "revolutionaries" belonging to a "Third World" force which will rise up and replace existing non-Communist governments in the years ahead.

"Anti-imperialism" is the theme of this

visible in all its depth and diversity. (Emphasis in original)

In the next page and one-half of its bulletin, the National Mobilization Committee calls upon all American citizens to support the SDS "10 days" of protest and resistance—April 21–30, 1968. The National Mobilization Committee also calls for support of the "international student strike on April 26, 1968," and the day of "international mass actions" on April 27, 1968.

The National Mobilization Committee asks each locality to work out its own format for the 10-day period and notify them of their plans.

The committee bulletin even suggests targets for visible opposition by stating:

The Symbols and machinery of war, violence and oppression are all around us: draft boards, napalm plants, air plane and armament factories, military installations, repressive police departments, etc. [sic.]

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE

The Student Mobilization Committee has even extended its efforts to recruit more bodies for its student strike down to the impressionable high school student level.

A handbill distributed to various high schools in the New York City area exhorts younger students to:

Strike! Oppose the war that kills your fathers and brothers!! Oppose the school administration that teaches that the killing of over a million Vietnamese in a racist war is legal!! Oppose the drafting of our friends and brothers, to die in a war we didn't start!!! High School Students! Leave your schools for one day to protest the war, the draft, and racial oppression!

The address and telephone number of the High School Student Mobilization Committee on the handbill is identical to the Student Mobilization Committee in New York City.

STUDENT STRIKE—DIVERGENT VIEWS

As one might expect, the various Communist elements within the mobilization were not without their differences as to the theme of the strike—or whether there should be any strike at all.

In the continuation of infighting, the Progressive Labor Party—PLP—"launched a direct attack both on the Student Mobilization Committee and the proposed student strike." PLP exhorted strike conference delegates at the plenary session to "vote against the student strike and to dissolve the SMC."¹⁴ It should be explained that the Progressive Labor Party are proponents of violent revolution as opposed to disruptive resistance. The student strike is classified as disruptive resistance.

However, the two largest domestic Communist organizations and their respective youth adjuncts—CPUSA—DCA and SWP—YSA—both proponents of the strike proposal—were reported in the Communist press to have resolved their tactical differences regarding the student strike and preserve the always shaky United Front.

The CPUSA, desirous of the opportunity for a continued fusing of the antiwar and racial issues as a dual central

theme for the strike, met head on with the Trotskyists at the "final plenary session of the conference."

The SWP—YSA "opposed the CP concept of turning the movement into a 'peace and freedom' organization," and preferred to maintain a single central "antiwar" theme.

The CPUSA outmaneuvered their Trotskyist opposition by handing the black caucus—NBAWADU—50 percent of the conference voting power.¹⁵

The SWP's official publication, the *Militant*, states:

This was the same gimmick the CP supported at the National Conference for New Politics Convention last fall.¹⁶

THE SDS POSITION

At the time the call to the Chicago strike conference had been issued in December 1967, the Students for a Democratic Society, largest of the new left student organizations, was already waist deep in its own plan for a campaign of coordinated disturbances throughout the Nation. The SDS militants have designated their disruptive campaign: "Ten Days To Shake the Empire."

The SDS "10 days" venture, April 21–30, 1968, will feature, primarily, "resistance"¹⁷ aimed at draft boards, Army induction centers and campus industrial and military recruiters.

C. Clark Kissinger, former SDS national secretary,¹⁸ and representative of the national leadership faction within SDS, was chairman of the Chicago student strike conference in January 1968. Kissinger's opening minute of silent tribute to the memory of Ernesto Che Guevara, the Castroite revolutionary, is indicative of that group of SDS national officers who wished to link "anti-imperialism" to the "antiwar movement" on a permanent basis. Their advocacy is "disruption and obstruction by whatever means necessary."¹⁹

Regional SDS leaders, on the other hand, are typified by those member organizers who work more closely with the campus chapters and comprise a very vocal second faction within the SDS superstructure.²⁰ This faction sees the current SDS strategy of head-on physical clashes with established authority as a "winless strategy" which has the effect of further isolating campus SDS members from the majority of responsible students. These regional leaders feel that "a mass anti-imperialist student movement" must be built on U.S. campuses; and further, that:

Strong ties between workers and students is absolutely essential for victory.²¹

¹⁵ *The Militant*, February 5, 1968, page 4.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *New Left Notes*, November 13, 1967. (SDS Official Publication.)

¹⁸ 1964–65.

¹⁹ Article: "Institutional Resistance," by Carl Davidson, *New Left Notes*, November 13, 1967. (SDS Official Publication.)

²⁰ While SDS has long prided itself on the announced "autonomy" of its campus chapters, it has, in the past year, despite factionalism, moved ever nearer toward ultimate total control of chapters by the National Council.

²¹ "The December National Council—A Different View," by Alan Spector, Debbie Levenson and Stuart Rose, *New Left Notes*, February 12, 1968. (SDS Official Publication.)

The Communist press reported that the "70 SDS members at the Student Mobilization Conference in Chicago felt the strike proposal will fit in effectively with their plans."²²

In a letter to the Washington Free Press, a Washington, DC-based "underground" newspaper, the SDS top three—Mike Spiegel, national secretary; Bob Pardun, educational secretary; and Carl Davidson, interorganizational secretary—stated:

The National Office [of SDS] will have to coordinate the proposed Student Strike and Weeks of Resistance in the spring.

As of this date, it appears that the larger university SDS chapters will participate—however reluctantly—in the April 26 student strike, especially in the New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles-San Francisco areas.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposal for the April 26, 1968, "students' antiwar, antiracist strike" was originated, promoted and consolidated by Communists.

Likewise, the Chicago strike conference—January 27, 28, 29, 1968—which voted to hold the student strike this spring was controlled and dominated by the Communist Party and W.E.B. DuBois Clubs on the one hand, and the Socialist Workers Party-Young Socialist Alliance on the other hand.

The Communist Party effectively assured the adoption of the "strike" proposal at the Chicago conference by first, assisting in the creation of the National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union—NBAWADU; and second, allotting this group of black militant extremists an unprecedented 50 percent of the total voting power of the conference.

The machinery of the Student Mobilization Committee has been kept intact over the past year, apparently for the express purpose of engineering a massive and well-publicized student strike in the spring of 1968.

The student strike and mass actions day—April 27, 1968—will be the Communist-run vehicles of irresponsible dissent and internal disruption within the United States. This dissent and disruption is designed to benefit the North Vietnamese enemy and the world Communist movement in general by undermining public support of the present U.S. policy of resisting Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

Communist organizations, the Communist press, Communist fronts and individual Communists have drawn together under the banner of the Student Mobilization Committee in a united front. The primary objective of this united front is to defeat American determination of continued support for U.S. policy in Vietnam. As secondary objectives, this united front hopes to, first, depict the U.S. Government as "imperialistic" in its policy of assisting nations which are presently opposing Communist aggression throughout the world; and second, to exploit the current racial tensions in the United States by blaming continuing ghetto problems on the diversion of poverty funds in order to fight Communist

¹⁴ *National Guardian*, February 10, 1968, page 4.

²² *The Worker*, February 4, 1968, page 12.

aggression in Southeast Asia and elsewhere.

If the Communists are successful in inducing a significant number of college and high school students to strike on April 26, 1968, and to partake in the mass disruptive actions on April 27, 1968—for whatever reasons—the international Communist propaganda network will use this incident to attempt to: First, create widespread public demand for reversal of present U.S. foreign policy; second, propagandistically give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere in the world Communist movement, but particularly in Vietnam; and, third, further dampen the resolve of America's allies who presently support U.S. policy in Vietnam, and make the war effort appear solely "America's problem."

BILL INTRODUCED TO PROVIDE FULL GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years now, a dispute has continued between the General Accounting Office and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, over the scope of GAO's audit of FDIC.

While to many of us, the law seems perfectly clear that the Congress intended that GAO audit the FDIC to the same extent that GAO audits the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the FDIC has refused access to bank examination reports. As a result, the GAO has been unable to advise the Congress as to the soundness and adequacy of the FDIC insurance fund.

We in Congress have a tremendous responsibility to assure that the public's deposits and savings in our insured banks are as safe as possible. Vigorous and competent examination by the Federal banking agencies is our first line of defense against bank failures which, unfortunately, are on the rise. In order to evaluate the adequacy and efficiency of FDIC bank examination procedures, as well as the adequacy of the insurance fund, unrestricted GAO access to all bank examination reports in FDIC's possession is necessary. All this was made clear on March 6 when Comptroller General Staats testified before your Banking and Currency Committee as we started hearings on the adequacy of bank supervision.

Thus, it appears that positive legislation is required to clarify the state of the law as to audits of the FDIC. The bill, which I am introducing today for myself, Representatives BARRETT, SULLIVAN, REUSS, GONZALEZ, MINISH, HANNA, GETTYS, ANNUNZIO, REES, BINGHAM, FINO, and WYLIE is quite simple and provides, among other things, that these examination reports acquired by GAO shall be

kept confidential except pursuant to court order or action by the Congress.

This bill, H.R. 16064 is very much in the public interest, and I foresee prompt action by your Banking Committee, Mr. Speaker, after we receive the views of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The full text is as follows:

H.R. 16064

A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the scope of the audit by the General Accounting Office

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 17 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1827(b)) is amended by striking "financial".

(b) The third sentence of that subsection is amended by changing "in use by the Corporation, pertaining to its financial transactions" to read "used by the Corporation, including examination reports of the Federal Reserve banks and the Comptroller of the Currency relied on by the Corporation in making its examination, pertaining to its transactions".

(c) Section 17 of that Act (12 U.S.C. 1827) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end:

"(e) Any information obtained by the General Accounting Office pursuant to subsection (b) that concerns the operation and financial status of an individual bank shall be confidential and may not be released by the General Accounting Office without prior approval of the Corporation except upon the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, or by direction of the Congress of the United States, or either House thereof, or any committee of Congress or either House duly authorized."

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the credentials, experience, and qualifications of various individuals to speak on Vietnam are paramount in a final evaluation of their pertinence, importance, and timing of their testimony. I know of no one more qualified to speak on American involvement in Vietnam than Dwight D. Eisenhower, commander in chief of Allied forces in Europe during World War II, commander of NATO blocking Communist aggression in Western Europe, and President of the United States for 8 years.

The following article contains the most recent statement by General Eisenhower on our involvement in Vietnam. This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 16 and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of every citizen of the United States:

UNITED STATES SEEMS ON RIGHT TRACK IN VIETNAM, EISENHOWER SAYS

Finding a solution to Vietnam is harder than it might be, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower says, because "I don't think

the American people really feel inspired to do anything."

At a news conference near Indio, Calif., Eisenhower said yesterday the United States appeared to be "on the right track" in its conduct of the war.

"We are not trying to destroy North Vietnam," he said. "What we are trying to do is make it too expensive for North Vietnam to try to dominate South Vietnam."

The ex-president met newsmen with Sen. Thomas H. Kuchel, R-Calif., who began a campaign for re-election this week.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

In other developments touching on the war:

The Department of Defense reported more than 135,000 soldiers and 41,000 sailors have volunteered for duty in Vietnam since 1965. Neither the Air Force nor the Marine Corps keeps totals on Vietnam volunteers, the Pentagon said.

But figures were available for all services on the numbers of men finishing tours in Vietnam who voluntarily extended six months or more in the 14-month period ending Dec. 31.

Volunteers for extra Vietnam service included: Army, 27,736 enlisted men and 897 officers; Navy, 3,761 enlisted men, officer total unavailable; Air Force, 3,837 enlisted men, officer total unavailable; and Marines, 13,913 enlisted men and 201 officers.

Sen. Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., said direct negotiations for an end to the fighting will have to be conducted with the Viet Cong—not just the North Vietnamese.

WOULD DEAL WITH VIET CONG

"Even if the North Vietnamese did sign an armistice with us," Percy said in an interview in Playboy Magazine, "the VC would carry on anyway, in my judgment, so we've got to deal with them."

Rep. Donald W. Riegle Jr., R-Mich., said the cost for each Viet Cong killed in 1967, in terms of U.S. military expenditures, was \$234,000. American deaths per thousand of enemy killed reached 106.5—"an erosion of the basic 10 to 1 'success ratio' required to win a guerrilla war," he said.

A nonpartisan businessmen's group calling itself Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace announced it was attempting to enlist the support of business executives all over the nation to oppose "the incredible obsession of a shrinking handful of men with a national mistake in Vietnam."

Sixty-three percent of 33,934 Protestants responding to a poll conducted by denominational magazines said they disapproved of the way President Johnson is handling the war, but their sentiments seemed on the hawkish side. More than half said the United States should use any force short of nuclear weapons to achieve military victory.

THE ONES WHO HAD ENOUGH

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that any single voice can add much to the comment and counter-comment occasioned by the political developments in the Democratic Party this last week. However, one feels about the timing and the manner the latest contender, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, entered the lists, there is no question concerning his right to do so. In fact, it speaks well for the system built on free-

dom of choice that the spectrum has been widened.

What is needed, however, Mr. Speaker, is a sober note of caution, if not to those deafened by the call of power or the beck of personal ambition, at least to those who will play dominate roles in the selection processes from now through August. The so-called Vietnam war issue, which I believe is more accurately described as our Southeast Asia or Pacific community policy issue, can be very dangerously misinterpreted and very erroneously articulated to our people.

We have those who equate this issue as simply a division between war and peace, an equation any thoughtful person would discard as an unworthy simplification; those who see the involvement as one to determine the future of one tiny nation—a nation yet to find its own identity. An experienced follower of world events would class such views as myopic. There are those who assess the struggle as a pure confrontation between communism and anticommunism. Any practical person would see this as a not-too-helpful, ideological abstraction of the pragmatic and real happening involving one-third of the population of the earth.

The sobering facts about what power will dominate this important emerging area and what this will do in the 25-year period that lies immediately ahead are the facts that need to be grasped.

The results of approaches suggested by any other candidate do not come to grips with these facts. Are our options widened or in fact narrowed by proposals being offered as alternatives to the present administration's approach? Act with caution, my colleagues. I warn you that particularly the fuzzy proposal of Senator KENNEDY will, in the long run, narrow our options and seriously compromise and burden our future.

Please take time to read and weigh the enclosed lead article from the *London Economist*. In my humble judgment the warnings, carefully stated, as to what could follow our capitulation to an easier road are soundly based. I do not take much comfort in pointing this out. Nor am I enthusiastic about our particular performance in Vietnam nor the clarity of our real objectives or policies in the Pacific community. I am not, because of this, ready to answer the call of the Lorelei and run the dangers lurking in the rocky shoals where facile, well-meaning obstructionists seek to lead us.

America needs to keep its "cool" more than at any other time in history. Listen intently to the divergent views. Watch with great care the total picture of our world politics. Think deeply on the long-term results and fully explore ramifications of what some candidates are suggesting. Do not expect that all problems must have quick solutions. Sometimes when events cannot be contained they will respond only to forces which are persistent, pervasive, and patient. There are people in this world who know and understand this and they are, at this time, your country's enemies.

Mr. Speaker, I include below the referred to article from last week's *Economist*:

THE ONES WHO HAD ENOUGH

General Giap has won half a battle, but he may have won the war. His demonstration of the communists' strength in Vietnam has shaken the Americans and it has brought Senator Robert Kennedy to the brink of challenging President Johnson. Senator Kennedy's calculation on Wednesday night was quite patent. If 42 per cent of the voters in the Democratic primary in New Hampshire think Senator McCarthy is right about Vietnam, it is clear that many Americans have become very tired of this war. This is Giap's doing. Two months ago in New Hampshire Senator McCarthy seemed unlikely to get more than 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the Democratic vote.

The attack General Giap launched on January 30th has failed to make a permanent lodgment in any of South Vietnam's towns. He has not yet attempted an assault on Khe Sanh or on any other position that the Americans hold in strength. But since January 30th General Giap has trebled the weekly roll of American casualties, and he has trebled Senator McCarthy's vote. He has shown Senator Kennedy his chance. The last few weeks have struck at the heart of the matter: at the Americans' willingness to go on paying this sort of price without a visible assurance that it will buy them victory in the reasonably near future. Senator McCarthy's 42 per cent is the vote of decent and troubled people for whom Vietnam seems a far-away country on the margin of America's national interest: a country that is just not worth it.

It is conceivable that Tuesday's vote exaggerates the extent of the swing against the war. Some of that 42 per cent may have been Democrats who dislike President Johnson as a man more than they dislike the Vietnam war. Others may have been Republicans and independents jumping into the Democratic primary for the pleasure of putting a boot into Mr. Johnson. Those are straws for Mr. Johnson to cling to. But it is more likely that the New Hampshire vote shows what the last six weeks have done to the self-confidence of people all over the United States. In that case there are only two things that can restore their confidence in Mr. Johnson's conduct of the war. One is for General Giap to risk a direct test of arms against a large American force, at Khe Sanh or elsewhere, and get beaten. The other is for the Americans and their allies to use some of the troops they have got clustered in and around the towns to reassert their control over some of the rural areas they have lost since January 30th.

If the Americans can bring either of these things off they may find that public opinion at home will recover its confidence after all: the New Hampshire primary may go down in the record books as the wince before the gritting of the teeth. But if either of these things is to happen it will have to happen soon, and it will have to be done with the forces that General Westmoreland has available to him now. The large reserves that General Westmoreland would like Mr. Johnson to call up are unlikely to make much difference in Vietnam before the year's end. That will be too late for Mr. Johnson. He may not get nominated by his party in August, and if he is nominated he will very likely not get elected in November, unless he can even the score with Giap this spring and summer. The New Hampshire voters have set the stopwatch: they have told him how long he has got.

If the Americans in Vietnam cannot recover some of the ground lost since January, and do it soon, the presidential election will burst wide open. The anti-war vote collected by Senator McCarthy has now brought Senator Kennedy to his moment of truth. It may be that, when he looks at it coldly, Senator Kennedy will draw back from a challenge to Mr. Johnson that could destroy both men

and put the Democrats out of power for half a generation. But Senator Kennedy, for all his qualities, is not his brother. His ambition and intellectual calculation may outrun his judgment. He will find it hard, having now gone back on his previous support for Mr. Johnson, to slide back into being a non-candidate again. It is not impossible that by the autumn the world may again be watching a Kennedy fighting a Nixon for the presidency. And this in turn will have its effect on Mr. Nixon's position. The swing against the war increases the chance that Governor Rockefeller will try to snatch the Republican nomination away from him even at this late stage. To prevent this happening, Mr. Nixon will presumably feel obliged to modify his previous support for the war.

This is what could happen in the United States. What will have happened in Vietnam, if the Americans cannot reassert themselves, is that they will find that General Giap has painted them into a corner. They will have been forced, by his superior generalship, into the "enclave strategy" that some armchair strategists last year were telling them to adopt of their own free will. Now that they are stuck in their enclaves the disadvantages of this strategy are painfully obvious. It leaves the communists free to strike wherever they want. It puts them within rocket range of many American airfields and supply dumps. It lets them press new recruits into service from the parts of the countryside the allies have abandoned. This is not a strategy that anyone in his right mind would choose. It is a defending general's nightmare. If the defenders cannot fight their way out of their enclaves by the summer they will either have to do it with a bigger army next year—but will the United States still have a President who is ready to go on fighting next year?—or negotiate from inside the noose. Mr. Johnson might try to negotiate on those terms himself. But it is pretty clear what sort of settlement that would produce. If negotiations take place as things stand now, with Giap's men sitting around the towns, it is hard to see how the communists can be prevented from taking a position in the postwar structure of South Vietnam that will give them command of the country within five years.

It is up to the Americans. *The Economist* does not wish to join those who are telling the Americans that they have been following the wrong policy in Vietnam for the past decade. It may be that the policy involves a price they no longer choose to pay; it has certainly run into great difficulties. But the reasons why the policy was adopted by President Eisenhower and continued by his successors have not vanished. Let it be said again. There can be no compromise solution in South Vietnam. The country will be run after the war either under a communist system or under a non-communist one. If the communists succeed in imposing their system, having beaten an American army by the technique of guerrilla war, it is folly to suppose that this will be an event without consequences. Once General Giap's men have got things fixed in Vietnam they can knock off the non-communist government in Laos with a flick of their little finger. It will be curious if they do not help Cambodia's communists to do the same in that country too: look at what Prince Sihanouk has been saying lately about the rebellion in his western provinces. And there are communist insurrections in Thailand, Malaysia and Burma, all in some degree under the control of North Vietnam or China.

The calculations of the men who are running these rebellions—and of the men who are opposing them—will inevitably be affected by what happens in Vietnam. And so will the calculations of other men far away from south-east Asia. Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Kossygin have taken some risks to stand up against the Chinese argument that guerrilla

war can beat "the imperialists" anywhere. They have plenty of opponents, in Russia and in the communist movement abroad, who will be happy to claim that if the guerrilla technique works in Asia it can work in Africa and Latin America too. The Soviet Union's leaders will almost certainly slide into a more adventurous foreign policy after an American defeat in Vietnam. They can doubtless see the dangers. But the pressure will be on them, from any part of the world where there is a communist party with a claim on their allegiance and a would-be Giap who thinks he can pull off another "war of national liberation."

These are the dangers in an American defeat. It would have been the same if the Americans had ducked the issue in Vietnam in 1961 or 1965. The same people would have drawn the same conclusions. The challenges would have kept on coming up. The Americans might have found a better place to face them; but it would have been a long way farther down the road. It is now up to them. They know that, unless General Westmoreland can restore the balance in the next few months, they will be back to where they were in 1966: the only difference will be that the war is bigger and nastier. They know what the cost would then be of putting things right: in the casualty lists, in money, and in the agony of watching it happen on television. But on the other side is the danger of a major erosion in the position of the only non-communist superpower: an erosion that would coincide (see page 85) with an erosion of the international monetary balance that has kept capitalism flourishing since 1945. These are great issues. No outsider can ask more than that, having examined what it would mean to accept defeat and what it would mean to carry on, the Americans should make their decision plain this summer and autumn. That is what a democracy is about. If the Americans emerge from Vietnam with nothing else, they can at least say they took their decision the democratic way.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS OF LOBBYING ACT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks today, I include for the RECORD our Republican task force comparison of title V of the Senate-passed and other reorganization bills.

Title V comprises amendments to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. The material I am inserting covers all of the sections under this title of the reorganization bill:

TITLE V—REGULATION OF LOBBYING

Sec. 501. Definition of Comptroller General.

Sec. 502. Multipurpose contributions and expenditures.

Sec. 503. Five-year preservation of records.

Sec. 504. Substantial purpose controlling.

Sec. 505. Contingent fees; broadcasting.

Sec. 506. Administration by Comptroller General.

Sec. 507. Violation of regulations.

Title V consists entirely of amendments to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (U.S.C. 2, chap. 8A), enacted as Title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Title V was not amended in any respect by the Senate. However, extensive debate occurred over an amendment to strike the entire title from the reorganization bill. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 4,

pages 5341, 5342, 5377, 5569, and part 5, pages 5643-5660. The amendment was offered by Sen. Hruska, carried a further amendment by Mr. Griffin, and was defeated 30 to 53 on a roll call vote.

COMPARISONS

Print No. 3 is identical in all sections to S. 355.

The Bolling and Reid bills, identical to each other except for one paragraph in Sec. 506(b) (a technical matter), differ significantly from S. 355.

In addition, a draft amendment prepared on behalf of Mr. Smith (Calif.) and Mr. Curtis would amend the Senate-passed bill at certain points in connection with the new Joint Committee on Congressional Operations and would amend S. 355 language with respect to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

SECTIONS 501, 503, AND 506

S. 355, Sec. 501 (definition), in conjunction with Sec. 506, transfers the administration of the Lobbying Act from the Clerk of the House to the Comptroller General.

Sec. 503 requires that statements filed under the Lobbying Act shall be retained for five rather than two years. (See Item 6 below.)

Sec. 506 confers on the Comptroller General the following powers and duties in connection with the amended Lobbying Act:

ITEMS

(1) to prescribe forms and regulations for its administration;

(2) to make available for public inspection all reports and statements filed under the Act;

(3) to ascertain whether any persons have failed to file reports as required, or have filed incomplete or inaccurate reports, and to notify such persons accordingly;

(4) to refer to the Department of Justice for appropriate action "any information coming to his attention, through complaints or otherwise, of any failure to register, or the filing of any false, improper, or incomplete registration or information under this title;"

(5) to make such studies and transmit to Congress such recommendations as the Comptroller General deems necessary in further carrying out the objectives of the Act;

(6) to retain reports for 5 years (see Sec. 503 above) and make them available for public inspection; and

(7) to make an annual report to Congress on administration of the Act.

Bolling. Sections 501, 503, and 506 in Bolling are parallel to S. 355 except that—

Wherever S. 355 reads "Comptroller General," Bolling substitutes "Attorney General" of the U.S.;

The Attorney General shall "review for appropriate action any information," etc. per Item 4 above;

A new item provides that the Attorney General shall supply the ethics committee of each house with copies of material furnished him under Item 4; and

Whereas the Comptroller General in S. 355 is to make an annual report to Congress on administration of the Act (see Item 7), in Bolling the Attorney General is to make such annual report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, and this report "shall be made public immediately" upon its transmission.

Reid. Identical to Bolling in all respects except that Reid provides for a Joint Committee on Ethics and Conduct (see under Title I), to which shall be sent copies of information per Item 4 (instead of to the separate ethics committees in each house).

Print No. 3. Identical to S. 355 in all respects.

NOTE. See Final Report page 53:

"3. Lobby registration information shall be filed with the General Accounting Office, rather than the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate. It shall be the responsibility of GAO to—

"(a) Maintain the registrations as public records for a 5-year period.

"(b) Deliver to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate quarterly records for publication in the Congressional Record.

"(c) Analyze registration information and deliver to the Congress an annual report on lobbying activities.

"(d) Refer complaints of failure to register or false or improper registrations to the Department of Justice for appropriate action."

SECTION 502

S. 355. Section 502 (taken in conjunction with the amendment made by Sec. 504) provides that *where contributions are received or expenditures made in part for lobbying purposes and in part for any other purposes*, the statements required to be filed by persons engaging in lobbying activities shall include only the portions thereof devoted to lobbying purposes, "except that if the relative proportions cannot be ascertained with reasonable certainty," *such statements shall show total receipts and expenditures together with an estimate by the registrant of the part thereof which was for lobbying purposes, and the part thereof which was for other purposes.*

Bolling. Same (with substitution of Attorney General for Comptroller General).

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE. See Final Report page 53:

"2. Organizations which contend that it is impossible for them to separate expenditures for lobbying purposes—and which have influencing of legislation as a substantial purpose—shall be required to file their total receipts and expenditures under oath and estimate the percentage properly allocable to lobbying activities."

SECTION 504

S. 355. Under the present Lobbying Act, reporting requirements apply to any person who solicits or receives money or other consideration "to be used principally to aid or the principal purpose of which person is to aid" the influencing of the passage or defeat of legislation. Sec. 504 of the reorganization bill amends that section of the Act to apply to any person who solicits or receives money or other consideration "a substantial part of which is to be used to aid, or a substantial purpose of which person is to aid" in lobbying.

Bolling. Same.

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE. See Final Report pages 52-53:

"1. The provision requiring registration by those who have as 'their principal purpose' the influencing of the passage or defeat of legislation shall be amended to require registration by those having such activity as a 'substantial purpose.'"

SECTION 505

S. 355. Amends the Lobbying Act to require full disclosure of contingent fee arrangements.

Additionally, this section amends the Act to place broadcasting on a parity with the press in regard to both exemptions and reporting requirements.

Bolling. Same, with substitution of Attorney General for Comptroller General.

Reid. Same as Bolling.

Print No. 3. Same.

NOTE. See Final Report pages 54 and 55:

"4. Individuals registering under the act who are to receive contingent fees for lobbying activities shall be required to state the terms of the fee in detail. This disclosure shall include a specific description of the legislation on which the fee is contingent and any other events which would affect the payment of all or any portion of the fee."

"5. The exemptions under the act applicable to newspapers and periodicals shall be

extended to include the television and radio media."

SECTION 507

S. 355. Amends the penalty section of the Lobbying Act to make the violation of the regulations of the Comptroller General under the Act a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 12 months or both.*

Bolling. Same (Attorney General instead of Comptroller General).

Reid. Same as Bolling.

Print No. 3. Same as S. 355.

SMITH-CURTIS DRAFT

Compare the following with Sections 501, 503, and 506 of S. 355 and the other bills.

A. Instead of to the Comptroller General (S. 355 and Print No. 3), or to the Attorney General (Bolling and Reid), the Smith-Curtis Draft transfers administration of the Lobbying Act to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

B. The Joint Committee shall—

(1) retain lobby statements for five instead of two years (same as S. 355);

(2) issue regulations after notice and hearing, such regulations to be published in the Congressional Record and in the U.S. Code as a note to the appropriate title (*new material*);

(3) make lobby statements available for public inspection (same as S. 355);

(4) notify the Justice Department of failures to register (under S. 355, the Comptroller General notifies such persons direct);

(5) notify the Justice Department of false, improper, or incomplete filings (appears same as S. 355);

(6) study and report to Congress on possible improvements in the Act (*not* stated in this Title but conferred upon the Joint Committee under Amendments to Title IV of Smith-Curtis Draft; in intent, the provision is the same as S. 355);

(7) make an annual report to Congress on administration of the Act (same as S. 355).

Reference to Section 502: Whereas S. 355 requires that when organizations cannot "with reasonable accuracy" separate lobbying expenditures from expenditures for other purposes they shall file total receipts and expenditures plus an estimate of that portion used for lobbying purposes and this information shall be available for public inspection, the Smith-Curtis Draft would require only that the estimates be available for public inspection, *not* the total receipts and expenditures unless so ordered by the Joint Committee.

Reference to Section 504, which substitutes "substantial purpose" for the old "principal purpose" definition—the Smith-Curtis Draft contains some different wording but is to all intents and purposes the same as S. 355 in this respect.

Reference to Section 505 re contingent fees and exemptions for broadcasting media. The Smith-Curtis Draft flatly prohibits contingent fees. The exemptions for broadcasting are same as S. 355.

Reference to Section 507 re violations. Same as S. 355.

IN DEFENSE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

*This section of the bill also repeals a provision of the Act which made it a felony for any person to engage in lobbying within 3 years after having been convicted of a violation of the Act. This provision has already been nullified by a Supreme Court decision which found it unconstitutional, and thus its repeal is technical only. The same in all four bills.

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, almost daily we hear of attacks being made upon the U.S. Supreme Court by well-intentioned but woefully misinformed citizens. We have heard remarks highly critical of the Court made by Members of this House; we read of law-enforcement officials blaming their troubles upon the Court; and, saddest of all, we often hear attorneys joining in the attacks and repeating totally false and emotional statements that the Supreme Court is "tying the hands of the police" or is "coddling criminals" at the expense of "decent members of society."

Members of the bar particularly have a positive duty to defend the Supreme Court against these unfortunate attacks. It is possible to question the wisdom of a particular decision without challenging the integrity of the Court as an institution.

I was therefore pleased, Mr. Speaker, to read a recent speech by Judge Donald P. Lay of the U.S. Court of Appeals made before the International Academy of Trial Lawyers. I will include the remarks of Judge Lay in the body of the RECORD. It is hoped that all Members will study this speech and will accept the challenge of Judge Lay to renew publicly their faith in the law and in the courts of this land. The speech follows:

LAW AND ORDER: DUE PROCESS OF LAW 1968 (Speech by Judge Donald P. Lay, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit)

In Plato's dialogue the question is asked: "What is there greater than the word that persuades judges in their courts, or the senators in the councils, or the citizens in the assembly, or at any other political meeting?" I am confident that the distinguished membership of this formidable array would acknowledge upon reflection: "No greater power hath man ever possessed." Never before in the history of man's continual efforts to avoid annihilation has communicative reasoning reached its present day to day importance. Ethical proof of this is readily observed within the recent debate at the feet of the World's Council concerning the Near and Far East conflicts. Failure of peaceful discussion to prevent bloodshed does not negate its force, but on the contrary confirms its truth. Without hope in the persuasion of the spoken or written word man has lost his only chance for survival. It is thus the resolution of conflicting interests by rule of law which gives our brief lives that transcendence which defines the true meaning of a lawyer's work.

The Spirit of Liberty began the pulse beat of this Nation when 180 years ago a few men perceived that government could not survive by human judgment alone. The debates which preceded the adoption of the Constitution recognized that though all men were to be free and equal, that equality had many different connotations to different men. View for example the pluralistic concept in Article IV, Section 3, Paragraph 3 and Article I, Section 2, Paragraph 3 of the Constitution where "free persons" are contrasted with "all other persons" or Article IV that dealt with fugitive slaves which read "no person held to service . . . in one state . . . escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service." Even our fore-

fathers viewed justice in terms of their own relative position. Times have not changed. The adversary trial exemplifies that as long as human judgment remains fallible justice will always take on whatever horizons a litigant's rose-colored glasses desire. I doubt if any of you have ever had a satisfied client who lost his case; at least I was never that fortunate.

Robert Schyler, in 1923, remarked that our Constitution was "a product of human experience; not of abstract reason." Schyler referred to the period of the Revolution and the events which preceded it, but apropos as such a maxim may be, the reasoning behind it falls short of the true historical significance involved. Long before the summer of 1787, men craved some means of assurance that their resort to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness would not turn upon another man's subjective concept of justice and fair play.

Although the quest for such assurance undoubtedly started long before 1215 A.D., history records its genesis with King John's meeting with the barons at Runnimead with their presentation of the Magna Charta. The 39th chapter of the Charta, perhaps the most well known, reads: "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way destroyed, nor will we go upon him, nor will we send upon him, except by the legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land." In essence the Magna Charta was looked upon as Arthur Sutherland describes, "a welcome assurance that people could set some limitation on the arbitrary powers of the King." Thereafter in English history there came the challenge by Parliament against the two Stuarts. This is documented in the Petition of Right of 1628, which became the impetus for the end of Star Chamber inquisitions in 1641. Perhaps the most modern mark of inheritance from the Petition of Right is today's recognition that men are to be discharged from unjust imprisonment upon habeas corpus. The final recorded event of significance within English history was the Revolution against the restored Stuarts and the passage by Parliament of the English "Bill of Rights" in 1689. Thus documentary evidence preserves man's emergence toward government by consent of the governed.

It is then fair to say that within the background of the Constitutional Convention is actually the entire history of man's search for an adequate safeguard or prophylaxis against abusive government. Alexander Hamilton long ago framed the dilemma when he said: "Too much power leads to despotism, too little leads to anarchy and both eventually to the ruin of the people." Hamilton, as many of you know, opposed a Bill of Rights, since he felt the Constitution itself was a Bill of Rights. However, Thomas Jefferson countered that "a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular and what no just government should refuse or rest on inference."

Well, where does all this take us—this synoptic course, if you will, in government? Perhaps it is refreshing to some simply to recall that which is so often not understood: that we are a society who have contracted with the rule of law; that we are not controlled by the subjective will of the majority or by an equation of justice by those placed in positions of trust to govern us. But assuredly this is not a lesson to properly bring before trained men proficient in the profession of law itself. I would like to agree, but today's circumstances forewarn that perhaps we all need to go back to basic fundamentals to reassess our proper goals. The lawyer's preoccupation with serving his individual client in getting a verdict or in meeting overhead ignores the public doubt, or for lack of time to investigate he recklessly joins the attack being made on the law itself.

King John's experiences with the baronage at Runnymede, Charles Stuart's death sentence before a high court of justice in 1649, as well as James II's abdication forty years later in the face of the English Bill of Rights, all relate a fundamental truth; a truth demonstrated at Bunker Hill, which is simply stated: the survival of any law must always depend upon the voluntary assent of the people it governs.

When law must be enforced by police coercion of the state, understanding and reason are supplanted for power or force. Force then governs, not law, for the law has failed and man's action is no longer controlled by peaceful assent to lawful interdiction. He then only understands coercive force.

Violation of law may occur for various reasons. Some people may feel that the law is unjust, such as our modern students of civil disobedience sometimes reason, or others disobey it because they have not learned to live within it. In either case, disobedience, civil or criminal, is brought about simply because people have not been taught to respect and cherish the rule of law. And the postulate then becomes self-evidence: that those who are taught to doubt do so because they do not know safely what to believe.

In 1954 the beloved Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter explained: "Broadly speaking the chief reliance of law in a democracy is the habit of popular respect for law. Especially true is it that law as promulgated by the Supreme Court ultimately depends upon confidence of the people in the Supreme Court as an institution. Indispensable, therefore, for the country's welfare is an appreciation of what the nature of the enterprise is in which that court is engaged—an understanding of what the task is that has been committed to the succession of nine men." Justice Frankfurter made this statement on April 22, 1954, before the American Philosophical Society. On May 17, 1954, the newly appointed Chief Justice Earl Warren handed down the Court's now famous school segregation cases, declaring the old doctrine of "separate but equal" inherently unequal. The Court ordered that Negro students be admitted to white schools in the states of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware and within the District of Columbia.

Shortly thereafter began the most volatile criticism of the Court since the days of President Roosevelt's court packing plan or even comparable to the divisive attacks made in 1857 after Chief Justice Taney's *Dred Scott* decision. In 1954, 96 Southern Congressmen joined in resolution by stating: "The decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases is clear abuse of judicial power. The original Constitution does not mention education neither does the Fourteenth Amendment or any other amendment." The aftermath of that Court's historic decision is present history. While Southern Governors defiantly refused to accept the rule of law, and force on extreme occasion supplanted it, the Supreme Court was sitting on another bombshell. In District No. 9 in New Hyde Park, New York, every day each class read aloud, in the presence of their teacher, an innocent, but simple prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon thee and we beg thy blessings upon us, our parents, our parents, our teachers and our country." Only Mr. Justice Stewart dissented as the Court held that the prayer was impermissible as violating the Establishment Clause of the Constitution. Shortly thereafter the Court declared school opening exercises consisting of a voluntary recital of the Lord's Prayer and voluntary reading of passages from the Bible as being equally unconstitutional.

This was too much. Letters swarmed Washington and Congress. Legislative hearings began to consider a constitutional amendment. However, in cool reflection numerous

religious leaders in 1964 opposed a House Judiciary Committee's study to tamper with the First Amendment. Nevertheless, last year a nation-wide poll indicated that the American public was still more disturbed over the school prayer decisions than any other decision.

As criticism began to mount, the Court began to bring within focus a long overdue recognition of procedural due process within state criminal proceedings. Perhaps with Runnymede in mind, Mr. Justice Frankfurter observed in 1943, in *McNabb v. United States*, 318 U.S. 332, 347: "The history of liberty has largely been the history of observance of procedural safeguards." Thus, in 1961 began a series of cases concerning which the average layman has been told turned murderers loose cell block at a time, prevented police from seizing evidence of the crime, strengthened Mafia control of the country, allowed a retrenchment of morality by the flood of obscene literature in the mails, protected juvenile delinquents and now, just recently, all gamblers as well as all criminals who own sawed off shotguns. Within this background, one can read in the newspapers at home or overhear at the drug store or barber shop, or perhaps even at a Bar Association meeting, that the Supreme Court has now become not only "godless" but disloyal as well. Without any consideration of First Amendment principles or of the facts or law involved, newspapers headline that the High Court has struck down laws which proscribe Communists from working in our defense plants, Communists from serving on our merchant vessels or teaching in our schools. And as if to put frosting on the cake for those who have in disgraceful tones endorsed the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren, we find renewed attacks by Congressmen that the Court has entered the political arena by disturbing the historic control of state legislators and congressional districts under the reapportionment decisions of *Reynolds v. Sims*, *Baker v. Carr* and *Wesberry v. Sanders*.

I would submit the average American today is being taught more infectious contempt and disrespect for the law through the dissemination of constant misinformation and unqualified criticism than ever before in our Nation. I suggest to you a simple but troubling truth: that a representative form of government cannot prevail in a society which thrives upon benighted ignorance. Emotional headlines and sermons daily reach the ears of the average American to understand, offered by persons who do not attempt to understand themselves. These headlines even affect lawyers who do not bother to understand or read the cases themselves. Recently a state legislator who theoretically graduated from a law school in a Midwestern state approached me and told me that he was happy that I was on the Court of Appeals and not the Supreme Court, because it would be almost an impossible burden if I had to follow the decisions of that particular Court.

How many of your children read Little Orphan Annie in the newspaper? A few months ago I read where Annie was talking to her dog Sandy about a poor fellow in a wheel chair, and says: "So he got crippled and lost everything; the cops caught the monster and he confessed and the court turned him loose. Oh, brother!"

I read a sermon the other day where a minister is talking on law and morals, and suddenly turns upon the Supreme Court with a vicious attack by saying it represents "the malignant moral tolerance of the public." The minister concludes "what a sad commentary it is on the morals of a Nation when its Supreme Court is more interested in the constitutional rights of criminals than in the inalienable rights of the people to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness." I wonder how many persons in that congregation came away with respect for law and its courts

that Sunday? This sermon demonstrated the total lack of understanding of what issues were involved. I am confident from his text that his opinion was formed from headlines of a newspaper and not from reading the opinions themselves. For these words of these great justices reflect a greater love and appreciation for law, liberty and morality than any such "harbinger of doom" could ever comprehend.

Do the headlines give the public confidence in the rule of law and the courts of this country? I wonder how many more in that particular congregation would have been assured if the law had been praised and explained, if the Supreme Court had been upheld as a great Court, in fact as one of the greatest of all times, would the people have had more respect for the law? Would we gain understanding and respect for law and order if information media would better explain the basic principles and reasons behind the decisions so the public could understand what the case is really about and why the result had been reached? Let me give you an example.

What if your 15 year old son was arrested and you were not notified of his arrest until late at night. You find he is in jail because a neighbor lady charged he used abusive, adolescent, offensive language to her over the telephone. Assume the Juvenile Court holds an informal hearing while you are out of town and only your wife is present, the neighbor lady is not called to testify, and the boy denies he used the foul language on the telephone but says another youngster did. You are not notified of any formal charges and all of a sudden the juvenile judge sends you a letter saying your boy is delinquent and he is sentenced to the State Reformatory until he is 21. In other words, a sentence for six years, whereas if an adult had been found guilty of the same offense the maximum confinement would have been 60 days. There is no appeal to the State Supreme Court from such an order. The boy was denied, because he was a juvenile: (1) notice of charges, (2) right of counsel, (3) right to confront complaining witnesses and cross examination, (4) privilege against self-incrimination, (5) right to a transcript of the informal hearing, and (6) right to appellate review.

Do you feel this is the kind of justice you want in America? Yet this happened to Gerald Gault, a 15 year old in Arizona recently. On May 15, 1967, the Supreme Court reversed this commitment as violative of the due process clause. The Court simply followed a well-founded guide for juvenile courts called "Standards For Juvenile And Family Courts" and the Report of the President's Crime Commission, which recommends: "Counsel should be appointed as a matter of course whenever coercive action is a possibility, without requiring any affirmative choice by child or parent." Yet the Supreme Court was severely criticized by certain members of the press as once again coddling criminals and thwarting criminal justice. Where do you stand? I'll tell you where you would stand if this ever happened to your son.

Judge Pound of the New York Court of Appeals made the statement sometime ago that best summarizes the concern with due process in criminal procedure when he said: "Although the defendant may be the worst of men the rights of the best of men are secure only as the rights of the most violent and most abhorrent are protected." I wonder if it would not cast some light if lawyers and judges, who profess to understand the law, could respond to informal criticism of the Supreme Court by paraphrasing Judge Pound saying, that we should all remember "that the rights of the best of men are secure only as long as the rights of the worst of men are protected."

Dean Pollock of Yale University Law School observes: "The community that falls

to insist on scrupulous observance of high standards of its police, by its prosecutors and by its judges and juries has surrendered responsibility for its most awesome institutions, such a community has lost track of the purposes which brought it into existence."

How easily these principles are forgotten or set aside in the emotional hysteria when the reckless headline is read. How hastily the average person forgets our basic heritage of the English experience and the proposition that every man is first presumed to be innocent, however guilty he may prove to be upon due inquiry. And that with this presumption of innocence it becomes the duty of every court to see that persons accused are denied no essential of fair trial or fair investigation.

Mapp v. Ohio, in 1961, barred state convictions premised upon evidence illegally obtained. Then came *Gideon's* trumpet which guaranteed the right of counsel to all persons charged with a felony, followed by *Malloy* with the application of the Fifth Amendment's principle of self-incrimination to the state defendant. These decisions immediately brought public denunciation of their own basic Bill of Rights. The *Gideon* case at the time was considered to be the most controversial. Thereafter many state prisoners complained they were deprived of their constitutional rights by failure of the state to provide them with right of counsel. The *Gideon* rule was held to be retroactive and in many states problems of procedure and retrial were reluctantly faced by state officials. Our court recently held last year in an en banc hearing that the State of Missouri had to provide right of counsel on appeal retroactively to all defendants convicted wherein counsel had been routinely denied the indigent on appeal.

However, in 1964 before the furor got off the ground, along came *Escobedo* and then finally the *Miranda* cases, which have all been so highly publicized. These cases further extended federal standards to state officers. In *Miranda* it was specifically spelled out that incommunicado interrogation of individuals in a police-dominated atmosphere resulting in self incriminatory statements without forewarnings of constitutional rights would not be acceptable.

Perhaps the basic misunderstanding relates to the Fifth Amendment and the privilege of self-incrimination. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter said in 1955: "No doubt the constitutional privilege may on occasion save a guilty man from his just desserts. It was aimed at a more far-reaching evil, a recurrence of the inquisition in the Star Chamber, even if not in their stark brutality. Prevention of the greater evil was deemed of more importance than occurrence of the lesser evil. Having had much experience with a tendency in human nature to abuse power, the founders sought to close the doors against like future abuses by law enforcing agencies." The same fundamental principles were at stake when the High Court struck down just a few weeks ago the gambling stamp tax and the requirement of registration for certain firearms under the National Firearms Act. Typical of the reaction was an editorial in a Midwestern newspaper the day after the decision came down. Quoting from the AP dispatch, the paper indicated that Chief Justice Warren dissented because he could not understand the reasoning of the majority. The paper editorialized that "we cannot understand the majority's reasoning either." I submit that the editors of the newspaper did not attempt to understand it because they didn't attempt to read it. The slip sheet opinion did not arrive in the mail until two days after the editorial was printed. The Chief Justice's dissent was on a legal basis and for what he considered proper legal reasoning. The eight judges of the majority disagreed, finding encroachment

upon our basic Bill of Rights in forcing any accused to incriminate himself. But these principles were never conveyed to the public.

A few voices in the dark shamefully acclaim that crime is caused or that criminal convictions are decreased because of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Those who voice such protests relating to federal prosecutions present puzzling causes. Their argument is difficult to rationally accept since the effect of these recent cases is merely to apply through the Fourteenth Amendment to the states what federal officers have been following for many years. I submit that any such person must disagree with Ramsey Clark, the Attorney General of the United States and J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover's statement made in 1955 was cited by Chief Justice Warren in *Miranda* as to the practice the F.B.I. follows today in criminal investigations. Mr. Hoover stated:

"Law enforcement, however, in defeating the criminal, must maintain inviolate the historic liberties of the individual. To turn back the criminal, yet by so doing, destroy the dignity of the individual, would be a hollow victory.

"We can have the Constitution, the best laws in the land, and the most honest reviews by courts—but unless the law enforcement profession is steeped in the democratic tradition, maintains the highest in ethics, and makes its work a career of honor, civil liberties will continually—and without end—be violated. . . . The best protection of civil liberties is an alert, intelligent and honest law enforcement agency. There can be no alternative."

Within the recent cases dealing with the principles of the First, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments, as now incorporated into the Fourteenth Amendment, is the one basic concept of "Fundamental fairness" when applied to criminal procedures before, during and after trial. These fundamental rights are guaranteed to you, or your wife, or your child, or your client, not because some judge equitably feels you are entitled to them in an individual case, but because there exists an irrepealable document called the Constitution of the United States.

Despite the clamor of a few disenchanted prosecutors and attorney generals, in my opinion, *Miranda*, and its progenitors are having a tremendous impact upon the effectiveness and dignity of law enforcement in the United States. A recent study done by the Yale Law School, as released in their July 1967 Law Journal, exhausts the overall area. It was carried on with the cooperation of all the police officials of New Haven, Connecticut, a city of 150,000. The study reaches certain conclusions that are rather interesting to consider: (1) That questioning was necessary to solve a crime in less than 10% of the felony cases in which an arrest was made. (2) That warnings have little impact upon a suspect's behavior; that if the suspect wants to talk he will do so notwithstanding the warning. (3) That if a lawyer is contacted before interrogation he can become a substantial aid to the suspect. The report states that the lawyer's presence does not affect the outcome in most cases in terms of a judgment of guilty or not guilty, but he can substantially better the suspect's chances of an opportunity to plead to a reduced charge or of receiving a favorable sentence after a guilty plea; and he can safeguard the rights of the innocent. (4) That the impact of *Miranda* and its predecessors has had an important and salutary effect upon the police. (a) They realize that their actions are subject to review and that they do not create the rules of interrogation. (b) That thorough investigations are being carried on to obtain corroborative evidence for trial.

In retrospect, I find it alarming that the majority of well-intentioned people view the Bill of Rights as hallowed ground only when

infrequently applied. Notwithstanding faith in a democratic majority, one can readily find in recent history instances where popular majorities have been defiant to the rights of minorities. James Madison and Thomas Jefferson insisted upon a written Bill of Rights which could permanently withstand despotic majority wills. The Judicial Branch of government became the only mechanism by which these rights could be protected and in this sense the courts became the guardians of the peoples' individual rights. History records that indeed the original Constitution would not have been ratified had it not been for the faith that it would be so amended to include a Bill of Rights. Thus our forefathers saw that constitutional liberty would always be in peril unless established by irrevocable rule. As Mr. Justice Davis wrote in *Ex parte Milligan*, "the Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in war and in peace and covers with it the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances."

A government is only as strong as the moral fiber of its people. Any government is only worth having as long as it can openly tolerate dissent and free channels of expression. Once we fear the extremes of associations or speech then we acknowledge the weakness of our own bond. Once we suppress minority rights in favor of the emotion of the crowd, we unwittingly sacrifice the majority's interest. If, in the name of justice, we are willing to let the end justify the means, let convictions be the goal at any cost, deprive the indigent and the unknowing of the right of counsel, overlook illegal intrusion of government into our homes and privacy, have loose standards of proper arrest and arraignment, allow police inquisition and trickery (an Attorney General of a Midwestern state told a Senate Subcommittee that he believed in using trickery to get confessions), I ask when this occurs do we really protect the interest of society as a whole. History's lesson teaches that the rights of the many are only secure as long as the very least individual right is sacrosanct from abuse.

Criticism of the Supreme Court is not new. Mr. Justice Holmes said a long time ago, such skepticism should be taken philosophically, but he added: "We should try to see what we can learn from hatred and distrust for the attacks upon the court are merely an expression of the unrest that seems to wonder vaguely whether law and order pay." Law and order in our democratic society requires a profound and grateful respect for law enforcement authorities, but simultaneously we must all demonstrate a reverential acknowledgment that the rule of law must govern mankind or we retreat to the totalitarian atmosphere of a paternalistic government.

The American lawyer holds in trust the great heritage of the law itself. When he publicly condemns it or its institutions he desecrates that heritage. This is not to say that the lawyer does not have a right to disagree with the law, but in debating it we should not allow the public to miscomprehend our adversary tradition as a charge of disrespect. We owe an obligation as keepers of the light to better inform, to enlighten if you will, the public as to the law, the reasons of the law, the basic liberties and democratic tenets at stake in the opinions of all courts. Today the American lawyer is failing that trust. This is a serious condemnation and yet it is true. We stand by and allow news media and mass communication to inculcate the public's minds through headlines with contemptuous disrespect for the courts and the law itself. Are we not all students of the legal and juridical personality? Do we not have special training to understand the law and its intricate machinery? Do we not daily profess greater knowledge in it than laymen? Yet laymen, ordinary men if you will, cannot

give obedience to the law if they do not feel it is revered and loved by those who claim to know its esoteric values. We must publicly renew the faith of the great and good men who met that summer in Philadelphia. We must renew our faith in the law itself and in its institutions. Our allegiance and love for it must find a new acceptance and favor in the same way you would want to proudly cherish, fondle and protect a new born son.

I serve a challenge to you as leaders of the trial bar of America: Renew publicly in your office, in casual conversations in the coffee shops, at the dinner table, on the golf course, on the public platform, and particularly through Bar Associations, your faith in the law and your greatest respect for all of the courts of this land. If you do, we will seek and win the ultimate triumph of justice itself.

OPEN HOUSING A CAMPAIGN ISSUE?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by the veteran publisher and syndicated columnist, David Lawrence, deals with a current issue, open housing, which is but a variation on a very old theme, Federal control versus individual rights. The issue of open housing has become a volatile one and, as Mr. Lawrence observes, might well be a prime campaign issue this year.

I include the column, "Open Housing a Campaign Issue?" by David Lawrence, in the RECORD at this point:

OPEN HOUSING A CAMPAIGN ISSUE?

"Open housing" may become a big issue in the national campaign this autumn. It affects directly more voters than many other questions which will be debated, and could cause the defeat of some Republicans and Democrats who will have voted in favor of the measure.

The proposed legislation would prohibit an owner from selling or renting his property to whomever he pleases through an agent. Less than two years from now, this would apply even to single-family, owner-occupied dwellings if the property is sold through a real-estate broker.

Persons engaged in the real-estate business throughout the country are alarmed over the prospect. They fear that home owners will feel compelled to dispose of their property on their own or through friends and acquaintances. It is pointed out that owners will be deprived of professional help in the selling of a house or in the financing arrangements or in the process of mediation which develops between buyer and seller in fixing the sale price.

The reasoning behind the protest is not so much related to a desire by an owner to discriminate between buyers, but is based upon a belief that, if certain neighborhoods are open to Negro purchasers, real-estate values will quickly drop and owners may see their equity reduced substantially.

There are 85,000 real-estate brokers or agents throughout the country, and they have consistently opposed interference by the government in what they regard as a transaction in private property. It is argued, for instance, that if the government can tell a person to whom he must sell his home when he gets ready to seek a buyer through a real-estate agent, then the same rule can also be applied to any kind of personal

property, such as a boat or a motorcycle or an automobile.

The pending legislation is not likely to raise protests in connection with the sale or rental of the large apartment buildings or new developments. In the smaller units there will be problems. For the present tenants may not wish to remain where racial mixing among the teen-agers may lead to disturbances.

Many real-estate men are saying that, while the forthcoming legislation stipulates certain exemptions for owners of single homes and 4-unit apartments, the mere fact that within 20 months new tenants may move into neighborhoods which have not been integrated is likely to arouse considerable concern as to the prospective values of the real estate. It is estimated that by Jan. 1, 1970, the new proposals, if enacted, will cover 44.6 million units, or 68 per cent of the nation's housing.

The Constitution plainly says that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law, "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Do the suggested restrictions mean that if the government supervises the sale of property, it is, in effect, "seizing" private homes? If so, it is being contended, the owners may ask for "just compensation" in the event that property values are diminished by reason of action by the government in forcing racial integration.

As the federal government steps into the housing field, this also affects the lending of money for mortgages. Federal funds will be withheld from those developments or projects wherein there has been any evidence of racial "discrimination."

What the federal government really will do will be to take the private real-estate business under its jurisdiction and start to supervise the sale and rental of homes. It is something novel for the federal government to become a party to the sale of private property. The question is raised whether someday its authority may be applied to insist that all forms of property, when offered for public sale, must not be disposed of on the basis of one's preference, even to friends or acquaintances, and only in accordance with a formula that corrects any form of "racial imbalance."

The "open housing" issue has been fought out on a state or local basis in referendums in different areas across the country during the last few years, and in many cases the people have rejected the idea at the polls. Certainly the "open housing" question will be debated in the coming presidential and congressional campaign, and many a Senator and Representative will find his vote on this issue in Congress challenged next autumn.

AL CAPONE A PATSY IN COMPARISON

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the present issue of Human Events, the alert Washington newsweekly, carried an extensive article by Phillip Abbott Luce entitled, "Is the U.S. Facing Insurrection?" Luce, a former leader of the new left, organizer of two students trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1964, and an officer of the progressive labor movement, is well qualified to comment on current happenings in radical circles.

The violence and destruction advocat-

ed by leaders of various radical groups in this country makes U.S. gangland history in this country seem like a tame game of boyhood's cops and robbers in comparison. Yet, the recently issued Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders gave but passing notice to this current threat.

I would suggest that one read this article by Mr. Luce and then consult the pertinent passages of the Riot Commission's report. One will wonder if both sources are dealing with the same subject.

I include the above-mentioned article from Human Events of March 23, 1968, in the RECORD at this point:

IS THE U.S. FACING INSURRECTION?—RADICALS AND BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES PLAN SUMMER OF VIOLENCE

(By Phillip Abbott Luce)

The summer of 1968 could well be the "longest" and "hottest" yet encountered in this country. The mass media, the police, the various investigating committees and the black revolutionaries are all predicting that it will surpass our past riot-torn summers in both violence and destruction.

Expecting these serious conflagrations, the police agencies throughout the country are training and arming on an unparalleled level. The various city governments are also preparing for the coming summer riots by attempting to rush into existence a myriad of "social welfare" programs to try to offset the intensive propaganda in the ghetto areas calling for revolution. And, on an individual basis, a growing number of white citizens are arming themselves against the day the riots spread outside the ghetto.

All of this spells trouble for the country: the worst outbreak of violence since the Civil War. It now appears that the riots that swept the country last year were only a training ground for both the police and the black revolutionaries.

Even President Johnson has admitted that we face a summer of ghetto violence. His special citizens committee, headed by Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois and Mayor John Lindsay of New York City, while overlooking the extent of the role of black revolutionary provocateurs, has also admitted that the outlook is good for continued ghetto riots. The FBI, the National Guard, federal marshals and the United States Army are also actively training men in the event that the riots again get out of hand and federal law enforcement is needed to handle the situation.

But, while the various police agencies are planning for the worst, the black revolutionary forces are also planning and hoping to expand the riots and to make them even more violent than in the past.

As a prelude to the summer, the first offensive will come in Washington, D.C., where the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King has called for a "poor people's campaign" to begin on April 22. Although this demonstration does not openly advocate violence, the actual programs of the "campaign" could well set off considerable violence in the Nation's Capital.

According to published reports, the Washington siege of Dr. King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference will include the picketing of government offices, a "lobby-in" in the halls of Congress and possibly the White House, "sit-ins" in federal buildings, the setting up of shanties in public places, "dislocating" the functioning of the government and blocking bridges and highways.

In a series of organizational meetings around the country, King has stated that "to dislocate the functioning of a city without destroying it can be more effective than a riot, because it can be longer lasting and more costly to society."

An informant has also told Sen. John McClellan's (D-Ark.) Permanent Investigating subcommittee: "King has turned to recruiting trained agitators from 'Black Power,' student and anti-war groups in order to fill out his ranks, save money and time. All his hard-core protestors will be professionals drawn from other militant groups."

King denies there will be any violence, but he has met secretly with black revolutionaries Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown, who at this point are planning to remain discretely in the background during King's camp-in.

King's planned demonstration is aimed at forcing the government to appropriate approximately \$10 billion to guarantee an "annual income" for everyone, including those with no jobs. Obviously, King is trying to blackmail the government into some action acceptable to him and various other revolutionaries. He has now openly warned the government that "If nothing is done, I think the riots this summer will be worse than last summer. Talk of guerrilla warfare can increase and even become a reality."

This so-called "poor people's campaign" may well turn into violence, but so far it hardly compares with other activities presently occurring in the ghetto areas of the nation.

Police reports, coupled with personal visits to any number of cities across the nation, have confirmed in my mind that unprecedented violence is being planned. It is especially important that we understand what the revolutionaries and Communists are hoping for this coming summer and what plans have already been laid in order to throw this country into a state of anarchy.

Richard H. Sanger, the author of *Insurgent Era* and one of the country's top authorities on the causes and patterns of political violence, has said that "it is well within the realm of possibility" that an open insurrection against the government is developing. Interviewed in *U.S. News & World Report* (Dec. 25, 1967), Sanger said, "We are passing from mere nuisance demonstrations over civil rights and the Viet Nam war to something much more violent and dangerous. . . . Based on my own experience observing the course of a half-dozen insurgencies and revolts overseas—in Algeria, Jordan, Kenya, Cuba, Angola and the Congo—I've been disturbed to note the similarities with the situation we now have in this country."

Following the riots last summer, the pro-Chinese Communist Progressive Labor party stated that "the wheels are turning, particularly in the minds of the black community, over the facts that an uprising of this sort [in Detroit] can stop the economy of a city, authorities can be made to blunder and muddle, fear can be instilled into a surprisingly large number of troops and police with some ease and guerrillas can operate effectively and with relative security in a city environment."

A new addition to the writing staff of the pro-Communist weekly newspaper, the *National Guardian*, is Julius Lester, a spokesman for SNCC and a co-traveler with Stokely Carmichael to Cuba this past year. In a recent column, Lester stated:

"The struggle will be long and hard and many a heart that now beats will be shattered by a spherical, powder-filled piece of steel. Those who oppress do not respond to petitions, demonstrations and the demands of the oppressed. The oppressor murders at his leisure and does not cease until the oppressed, recognizing that the oppressor has no right to oppress, assert their right to live by using the only language the oppressor has ever used and the only language that he understands—the sound of gunfire, the sound of dynamite, the sound of his own death in his ear."

From visits to a number of ghetto areas throughout the country and in conversations

with both black militants and police two distinctive characteristics have become apparent: The mood of the ghetto is seething under the winter's cold and many black people seem willing to engage in almost kamikaze battles in the coming summer. Secondly, the black revolutionaries have changed their propaganda campaign from one advocating simple revolution and violence aimed at overthrowing the "white people structure" to an approach that stresses the need to arm and prepare for violence that will be initiated by the white man.

The revolutionary elements in the ghettos are now advocating violence as a response to "genocide" which they claim is about to be launched by the police. This kind of insidious propaganda is to be found everywhere and is being spread in pamphlets and speeches.

On February 18, Stokely Carmichael told a group in Oakland, Calif., that "Many of us feel that they [the whites] are getting ready to commit genocide against us." This kind of irresponsible demagoguery has led the black revolutionaries to making even more rash statements. James Forman, the international director of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, is presently asking fellow revolutionaries to fulfill the following "in the event" he is "assassinated":

"Ten war factories destroyed.
"Fifteen police stations blown up.
"Thirty power plants demolished.
"No flowers.
"One Southern governor, two mayor and 500 racist white cops dead.
"A generous, sustaining contribution to SNCC."

Forman is also quoted as demanding in the event of the "assassination" of Stokely Carmichael or H. Rap Brown that the above figures be doubled.

Julius Lester, writing in the *National Guardian*, parrots the same incredible line. In the February 24 issue of that paper he states: "The government has made extensive preparations for the coming summer. If necessary they'll hire somebody to go throw a rock through the window of a ghetto store. Any way you go, there is going to be violence this summer. . . ."

"Faced with the prospect of extermination, blacks are arming themselves, and saying thereby, if you are marked for death, just don't die without knowing that some honky is going to be buried the same day you are. And preferably, two or three."

To anyone who might resist this view of white America, Lester has this to say:

"For those who read this and can only view it as extreme paranoia, reflect on the history of this country—the rape of Africa for black slaves, the extermination of the Indian, the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the war in Viet Nam. America's history shows that its capacity to murder is unfathomable. Hitler is held up to us as the example supreme of a madman, but only so that attention will be drawn away from our own madness and insanity. Blacks are taking up arms to respond to this madness. It is not the role of whites to argue against this."

A recent important merger involving SNCC points up this new approach to this coming summer's violence. The merger, which ties SNCC organizationally to the violence-oriented Black Panther party of California, was announced at a meeting called to celebrate the 26th birthday of Huey P. Newton, the Black Panther's "minister of defense."

Last October, Newton, who is prone to having himself photographed in an animal skin-covered throne while dressed in a black leather jacket, beret and holding a long rifle in one hand and a spear in another, was arrested and later indicted for murder, assault with a deadly weapon on a police officer and kidnapping.

This case, which is a rallying cry for the

black revolutionaries, is presently awaiting trial but the alleged facts indicate that Newton, who admits to always carrying a weapon, was stopped by Oakland police and after a serious altercation took place in which one policeman was shot to death and another wounded, Newton commandeered a passing car and forced the driver to take him to a hospital where he was treated for a stomach wound and later arrested.

It will be recalled that it was the Black Panther party that staged an armed demonstration at the state capitol in Sacramento some months ago in opposition to legislation favoring "gun controls." The announcement of the Black Panther-SNCC combination came from Eldridge Cleaver, the Black Panther "minister of information" who told the gathered participants: "You've all heard bits and pieces about the merger of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Well, it's a fact."

The new combine has announced its intention to run Huey Newton in the 7th Congressional District of Alameda County as a write-in candidate on the ultra-left "Peace and Freedom" party ticket.

At this same meeting, James Forman, who was named as minister of foreign affairs for the Black Panthers, again promised instant and specific retribution for "assassination" of black revolutionaries. He specifically singled out "these white piggish cops that occupy our communities" for murder.

H. Rap Brown spoke at the same meeting, in violation of judicial "travel restrictions" placed on him following his arrest in New Orleans for carrying a rifle in interstate commerce. Brown is presently in jail facing charges in New Orleans and in Maryland for his role in the Cambridge, Md., riot last summer.

Former SNCC Chairman Stokely Carmichael spoke about Huey Newton and his only criticism of Newton was that "if he was going down on the honky cops that night, he should have told me first." Carmichael said black people must "Create alternative systems of justice and become executioners if necessary when white cops murder black people."

In city after city that I have visited since September I have been struck with the same type of advocacy of violence among the black revolutionaries. A youthful black revolutionary in Detroit told me recently that he, along with various members of the ultra-leftist Revolutionary Action Movement, was storing arms in preparation for the summer. In Columbus, Ohio, a black leader told me that he had seen a variety of automatic weapons secreted throughout the ghetto area and that these arms included machine guns. The same picture was obvious in Newark, New York, Chicago and Miami.

The police in a number of cities are working feverishly to prevent this summer from turning into a blood bath of unimagined proportions. Special riot control classes have been held in most major cities and the police have been armed with a variety of new weapons to help control serious outbreaks of violence. In Atlanta, Ga., the police have even developed an evacuation plan in case the riots get out of control and sectors of the city have to be left to the rioters. Their plan also contains a counterattack strategy to regain these abandoned areas.

The Communist-controlled Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM) has been especially active in the ghettos during the past year, although it has been hard hit by active police surveillance and arrests. RAM is headed by Robert Williams, who now lives in Peking, China, rather than return to the United States and face kidnapping charges. Despite his absence, his RAM organization has been involved in any number of bizarre attempts to foment violence in the United States. This is one organization that matches its violent outcries with action.

A front-group for RAM, the Black Liberation Front, was responsible for the abortive attempt to blow up the Statue of Liberty and the Washington Monument in 1965. Three of its members later served prison sentences for their attempt. One of those convicted, Robert Collier, is now working on a Mayor Lindsay poverty project in New York City.

Last summer 17 members of RAM, including its U.S. leader Max Stanford and the assistant principal of a Long Island night-school, were arrested in a plot to assassinate the "moderate" black leaders (Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young). The hope of these RAM members was to create panic in the ghetto areas and place the blame on "white extremists."

Then, this past fall, Philadelphia RAM members came up with a program to poison the city water supply and kill off the members of the police force. On February 26 of this year two members of RAM in Philadelphia pleaded guilty to charges of plotting a riot there last summer. They planned to place potassium cyanide in the water supply and then begin a riot once deaths started occurring.

In the issue of Robert Williams' publication, *The Crusader*, most recently distributed in this country (it is printed in Communist China) he lays specific plans for the summer. He tells his readers:

"A tightly organized and highly mobile underground guerrilla force would have to be clandestinely organized. This well-disciplined force would play a more aggressive role. It would be well versed in handling explosives and deadly accurate when deployed as snipers. Its mission would be retaliation, to visit attrition upon the enemy and to pin down and bring about a dispersal of his concentrated forces.

"This guerrilla force must operate in small bands and know every inch of that part of the city where it is to operate. It must control its fire and use its ammunition sparingly. It must be highly mobile and constantly shift its position when sniping to avoid detection, death or capture. It must have a perfect understanding of its mission at all times.

"When operating in full view of great throngs of people, its members should cover or mask their faces to prevent revealing identity. It should handle its weapons with gloves, especially the captured ones, so as not to leave incriminating fingerprints on weapons that may later fall into the hands of repressive authority. These groups, while sniping and performing other missions of sabotage, should be extremely careful in avoiding death and injury to the friendly black population."

It has already been proved that much of the sniper fire directed against the police and army troops in Detroit last summer came from members of RAM. Robert Williams now envisions new work for his sniper teams. In the same issue of *The Crusader* Williams goes on to give specific instructions on how to make a new kind of bomb:

"Molotov cocktails are very effective weapons in urban guerrilla warfare. However, a jumbo size is even more effective. The jumbo size or the Black Power Bomb can be most effectively used against tanks and armored troop carriers where streets are narrow and buildings are three or four stories high.

"The jumbo size of the gasoline bomb can be made by using an empty syrup bottle of one-gallon capacity. These gallon-sized glass jugs are usually available around confectionaries, drugstores, restaurants and warehouses. Each is equipped with a screw-on cap and is fitted with a finger grip or a built-in ring by which to handle the bottle or jug with a single finger.

"This type of jug can be filled with almost three-fourths gasoline, about one-fourth extra-heavy motor oil with lubrication grease added. The screw-on cap should be tightened after which a Tampax, well-soaked in gaso-

line, should be securely taped or wired to the jug. The soaked Tampax or well-soaked rag is lit when the individual is ready to heave the Black Power Bomb.

"The glass jug or container breaks on impact, thus igniting the gasoline, oil and grease, resulting in a napalm-like effect. This is highly effective when heaved from a roof top into personnel (troop) carriers. It can also be thrown as a satchel charge against tanks and other armored vehicles."

It is highly improbable that a revolution such as that envisioned by Williams could succeed. After all, the black man in the United States only constitutes about 11 percent of the population, only a small portion of which would be willing to go along with such violence. Also, the conditions for an extended guerrilla war just do not exist in the United States.

Nevertheless, Williams ends his recent issue of *The Crusader* with this prophecy:

"Yes, a minority revolution could succeed in racist and imperialist America. Its chances of success today are better than at any previous time in history. America is an imperialist power with its tentacles spread around the world. It has arrogantly proclaimed its hypocritical self savior of the entire world. The fact of the matter is that it cannot even save itself. The American black man holds the balance of power in the world today. He holds the fate of America in his hands."

The nation has been fortunate that to date the ghetto riots have not spread into industrial and suburban sections. But plans of various black revolutionary organizations now reveal that they hope to change that pattern this summer. As an example of what they have in mind, there is evidence that during the Newark riots last year a number of cars full of black revolutionaries attempted literally to invade a nearby suburb but were turned back by the police.

A major hope of the various Communist organizations is to urge the black people of the nation to "rise up" against the white government. The Communists do not seriously believe that a black uprising could in itself overthrow the government and create a "black state." Instead, the Communists believe they can utilize the black nationalists to create riot conditions, thereby fomenting a race war and, they hope, nationwide anarchy.

It may sound extreme and unrealistic, but the Communists are convinced that a race war, pitting white against black, would naturally evolve into a situation in which the various law enforcement agencies could not contain the violence and law and order, as we know it, would evaporate. In this situation the Communists would hope to attempt a *coup d'etat* and possibly take power.

Of course, it must be stressed, this is only a theory, and to date the Communists know they are not strong enough to implement such a strategy; as one expert sizes up their immediate goal, "revolution, no—insurrection, yes."

Across the nation, in ghetto after ghetto, the cry for violence is being echoed by every black revolutionary—most of whom have organizations backing them up. The big-city ghettos are obvious areas of radical activity, but lately even the smaller ghetto areas have not escaped the revolutionary activity of the black nationalists.

A recent report from Reading, Pa., gives an example of the kind of bravado being exhibited. A black revolutionary there named Kiraka, who leads a group called the Progressive Organization of Afro-American Youth (POAAAY), has been quoted as stating: "As I see it, 'Black Power' is the last call for white America to accept the black man, his demands and his standards . . . our own culture, etc. If society fails, as they are failing now, the ultimate end will be a violent revolution."

This kind of revolutionary talk now can be

heard throughout the United States. Although the police are preparing for extensive trouble, this summer may test our national will to survive.

Rap Brown succinctly stated the political irrationality of the black revolutionaries which the country is up against when he bragged:

"I say that if America don't come 'round, America should be burned down."

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT LUNCHEON HONORING POSTMASTER EPHRAIM MARTIN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1968, a luncheon was held in Boston sponsored by the Boston Mail Users Council honoring the postmaster of Boston, Hon. Ephraim Martin. The principal speaker at that luncheon was Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, the Postmaster General of the United States.

After congratulating Postmaster Martin on his years of dedicated public service, the Postmaster General stressed the close relationship between the Federal Government and business, stating:

Throughout the Federal Government the watchword is cooperation with the business community.

In my remarks I include this address delivered by Postmaster General O'Brien:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, AT THE LUNCHEON HONORING POSTMASTER EPHRAIM MARTIN

I must tell you that I have very mixed feelings about sharing this ceremony with you today. First, of course, I am delighted to join with you in honoring your Postmaster, Ephraim Martin, who holds this century's record for length of service as Boston's Postmaster, and who has a distinguished public service career spanning twenty-five years.

One of the most profound statements that I ever heard John F. Kennedy utter was when he was asked for his definition of happiness. He said that "happiness lies in full use of your powers along lines of excellence." Well, I can only say that your entire career, Postmaster Martin, is a brilliant example of full use of considerable powers along lines of recognized excellence. Therefore, I think you must be that all too rare human being—a truly happy man.

Certainly, as a "Yankee from Brooklyn" you showed all us Bay Staters that we have no monopoly on ability and hard work; and there is even a rumor that you have your own version of the Blarney Stone.

I know also that you destroyed my notion about people from Brooklyn. I once was told how a man could easily pick out a fellow from Brooklyn from any crowd. Simple. He's the guy who asks you a question, tells you the answer . . . and then says, "You're wrong."

Well, your legions of friends and admirers know that this description isn't typical of you at all. They recall, as far more accurate, your personal motto, a motto that I think well reflects your modesty and your understanding of how to get results. That great American philosopher Leo Durocher once said, "Good guys finish last." Of course, we

must remember he said this at a time when the Brooklyn Dodgers were finishing last. But I think Postmaster Martin's philosophy is far sounder and by far more meaningful: "There is no limit to the good a man can do if he doesn't care who gets the credit." The record shows clearly the staff and employees of the Boston Post Office share this philosophy.

Of course, Postmaster Martin, the abilities of you and your staff have already been justly and publicly acknowledged by the Direct Mail Advertising Association which honored you two years ago as Postmaster of the Year.

Through your intense efforts, there is an entirely new emphasis on cooperation between the mailing public, particularly large mailers, and the post office. Further, the Boston Mail Users Council is widely recognized as one of the most vigorous and effective in the nation.

And I want to take this opportunity to recognize the very significant contribution being made by Regional Director Don Steele and his staff to more efficient mail service. Don and many members of his staff are old friends and associates of mine. They are doing a great job and I want to publicly recognize their contributions to the postal service throughout the New England area.

Yesterday, I had the pleasure of talking to the Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation here in Boston, and I brought to that group a message from the President, that I think is worth repeating here today. "One of the most difficult problems facing anyone in dealing with people, whether in government or in business, is the problem of people shaping today's actions on the basis of yesterday's realities," the President said. He continued:

"Far too often the truth is distorted, not by lies, not by deliberate fabrications, but by mythology. Too often men, rather than look around at the real world, cling to the clichés and stereotypes of yesterday. Each new fact that marches down the road of experience is seen, not for what it is, but for what men think it is, or should be, or might be. Too often our wishes, or worse, our fears, distort and obscure our opportunities. There is an only too human desire to wallow in the comfort of yesterday's well-broken-in ideas and beliefs. Unfortunately, such ideas and beliefs, in today's fast changing world, have no bearing on the problems of the day and the needs of the people."

I think these words of the President merit our attention. For what we often take for granted as common sense, may be based on circumstances that no longer exist, if they ever did. As an old philosopher once said, "Common sense is that which tells you the world is flat."

One area where yesterday's common sense is today's complete error involves the belief that there is some kind of pre-ordained combat between government and business.

There were times in the past, certainly, when friction and misunderstanding between government and business were the product of government involving itself in new areas of activity, taking on new responsibilities, regulating areas once free of control and supervision.

Given the changing relationships, given the new thrust of government into areas once marked "off limits," the concern of business was understandable.

But that concern now no longer has any foundation.

The thrust of government effort today is to work with business to the maximum possible amount.

We see this fact illuminated in many areas of activity.

We see it in the one billion dollar effort of the life insurance companies of America to help solve urban housing problems.

We see it in the really attractive travel package being devised by a large number of American businesses to make travel to and in the United States less expensive for foreign visitors. This will ease our balance of

payments problem and may also bring to Massachusetts the 2,880,000 Irish from Ireland who want to see how most of the world's Irish live.

And we can also see evidence of cooperation between the Federal government, local government and business all around us in the rebuilding of the great city of Boston.

Whenever I visit this city I am always struck by the progress that has taken place since my last visit. For example, I asked Don Steele this morning why he kept looking around so nervously. "It's the building boom here. If I'm not careful, someone will put up a building around me. It's happened three times in the last month." I have a feeling that he was exposing me to a bit of his brand of blarney, but I do know that a short walk from this building would bring us to five or six of the city's twelve renewal projects.

When Postmaster Martin took command of the Boston Post Office ten years ago, the picture was not so bright. Boston was thought to be a city without a future. Population was shrinking, taxes were rising, there was dilapidation everywhere, vacant lots were increasing, businesses and jobs were leaving at an ever increasing rate, the tax base was shrinking. In a relatively short time, half a billion dollars of assessments were lost through deterioration of properties and through land taken off the tax rolls. No major construction had taken place in Boston since the 1920's. Not one single unit of low-cost family housing had been added to the city's housing supply since 1954.

At the Federal level there had been no major housing legislation since the Housing Act of 1949 and certainly scant attention paid to the problems of the cities.

The nation is still suffering because of that inaction. Both President Kennedy and President Johnson have recognized these problems and given their solution high priority.

In late 1960, Boston began a massive Urban Renewal Program. Its objective was the physical up-grading of housing, community, commercial and industrial facilities in Boston. A short time later, in response to President Kennedy's request, the Federal Government began its own assault on the problems when Congress passed the far reaching Omnibus Housing Bill. Boston was one of the first cities to take advantage of this and other expanded Federal programs. Early in 1961, a group of concerned Bostonians had met for the purpose of charting a social up-grading program to complement the physical renewal being planned. Out of this, grew Action for Boston Community Development. With passage of the Federal Anti-Poverty Legislation in 1964, ABCD became the agency charged with administering Boston's anti-poverty program.

Also, in 1964, the Congress, at President Johnson's request, created the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Other landmark pieces of legislation, involving close cooperation with business—Model Cities, the Manpower Training and Development Act—have been passed since then. There was and is a clear commitment at the Federal level to meet the challenge and develop the means to solve urban problems.

Let's take a look at just one of these programs as an example of how Boston is going as a result of Federal initiative, vigorous local leadership under your progressive Mayor Kevin White and with business cooperation. Boston's total renewal program involves one-third of the City and over one-half of the City's residents. In addition to the renewal program there is Boston's Model City Program which in itself involves another 10% of Boston's population. The total public and private investment in all these areas approximates more than two billion dollars.

Contrast this surge of effort with the fact that in 1959 not a single major commercial building was under construction.

This record of a great city rebuilding itself into a greater city is one you can justly feel proud of.

And today I want to report to you on a further step by the Federal government to facilitate private building. Responding to a request from Mayor Kevin White to do what we could to facilitate the acquisition of the best possible site for Boston's largest office building, the new \$75 million, sixty story John Hancock building, I have today asked our Regional Director to move ahead quickly with disposition of the Back Bay Postal Annex. This decision will make the optimum site available and permit construction plans to proceed rapidly.

Today, my friends, throughout the Federal government, the watchword is cooperation with the business community.

That cooperation by no means excludes local government. In fact, enlightened local government, the kind you have here in Boston, is the key to progress. I know that is one of the principal reasons why our Governor, acting as chairman of the Governor's Conference, told President Johnson in Washington that he had worked with three Presidents and "... no one has worked more than you have to promote Federal-State relations."

I also know that the Postal Service and other Federal agencies will continue to work closely with Mayor White.

As the result of this new atmosphere of cooperation, as the result of the continuing efforts at promoting an understanding of the mutuality of interest of post office and large volume mailers, we see a clear demonstration of what effort, energy, imagination and commitment to the public good can mean for all of us.

Postmaster Martin, your contributions have been truly outstanding. And the tradition of cooperation that you have done so much to raise as a standard of excellence will continue to guide us in the days and years to come.

DISABLED VETERANS SUPPORT PRESIDENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are concerned about the war in Vietnam, but I believe most Americans are convinced that we are pursuing the right course there, and that we will be successful if we continue vigorously to pursue that course. The President's statement last Saturday, reaffirming our determination to win victory against Communist aggression in Vietnam, was a declaration which I believe most Americans strongly support.

Last month in Washington, the National Executive Committee of the Disabled American Veterans adopted a resolution, entitled "Support of the President's Policy on Vietnam." By the very nature of their organization, the Disabled American Veterans are the group which must have the deepest personal knowledge of the price of war.

The DAV has decided by resolution that our determination and ultimate victory are worth the price. I would certainly like to have this resolution appear in the Record so that all of us can take part from the attitude of these men who have suffered permanent injury in previous wars.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S POLICY ON VIETNAM

Whereas, the United States has committed itself to a course of action in Vietnam, and Whereas, the purpose of America's commitment is to fight a successful war to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam, and

Whereas, the Government of South Vietnam and the Governments of Southeast Asia look to the United States for help in protecting their freedom and their right to be left in peace, and

Whereas, the present Administration needs and must have the unqualified and unified support of all citizens loyal to our country in these perilous times, and

Whereas, should Communism win in South Vietnam, other Nations in that area will become principal targets until all Southeast Asia is under Communist domination, and

Whereas, the President has made every effort within reason to obtain a peaceful settlement; and the Communist North Vietnamese has shown no willingness to respond, and

Whereas, only the President can really make foreign policy and command our Nation's war effort,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the DAV hereby reaffirms its approval and support of the decisions made by the President, as Commander in Chief, in his fixed purpose to stem the Communist determination to control South Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia.

HOMETOWN NEWSPAPERS SALUTED BY OUR G'S

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of newspapers in the Second District of Oklahoma have a policy of sending copies of the hometown paper to men stationed in Vietnam. I believe these publishers are to be commended for their generous and personal support of our fighting men, and I know from my own visits in Vietnam how important news from home can be.

A good example of the appreciation for this link with home and of the fine spirit of our forces is shown by these two letters which appeared in the Pictorial Press of Tahlequah, Okla., on March 7, 1968:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DEAR EDITOR: Just a few lines to express my gratitude for the copies of The Pictorial Press you have sent me.

I will soon be returning home (Peggs). Thanks to community leaders such as you who have taken time and effort to remember us when we are away from home to make this long, long year seem a little shorter.

Thanks again, and congratulations for the fine work your newspaper is doing for the community.

Sincerely,

Msgr. G. D. TOMBLIN.

VIETNAM.

DEAR EDITOR: For the past 16 months I have received your newspaper. It has informed me of what is going on at home and really brought home closer to me. I'd like to Thank you for remembering all of us while we're over here.

This isn't what we want to do, but if

we don't stop Communism in Viet Nam, we may be fighting them in Los Angeles, New York or Tahlequah some day. If more people at home supported us in our fight, the war would be over soon. Though only 18 when I first arrived in Viet Nam, I've learned quite a bit about the people. They want their freedom as much as we did in 1776.

It's for people like you that we fight this war. Instead of provoking our cause and printing anti-war slogans, you try your best to bring home town news to the Tahlequah boys fighting in Viet Nam. As a Tahlequah boy and a member of the Special Forces in Viet Nam, I'd like to say "Thanks" for myself and my unit for remembering us. I'm sure all the other Tahlequah boys in Viet Nam feel the way I do.

Sincerely,

TOM ROACH,
5th Special Forces.

VIETNAM.

INDUSTRIAL BOND RULING HARMFUL TO OKLAHOMA

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Department of the Treasury decided suddenly to eliminate the tax-exempt status of certain industrial development bonds issued by States, counties, and towns to help create jobs for their citizens. These bonds have been used with great success in Oklahoma, and a number of us from Oklahoma were quite disturbed by the ruling.

I have received a resolution from the Oklahoma Industrial Development and Park Commission over the signature of its very able chairman. Lt. Gov. George Nigh, which very strongly presents the feeling that all of us from Oklahoma have about this ruling. I would like to have this ruling appear in the RECORD.

It is my deep desire that Congress can pass legislation which would permit the continued issuance of these bonds, which have opened the door to employment and prosperity to many of the communities in my district, while at the same time curbing certain abuses of these bonds.

RESOLUTION BY OKLAHOMA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PARK COMMISSION

Whereas the U.S. Treasury Department has by recently announced ruling arbitrarily overturned the long standing exemption of interest paid on bonds issued by States and their sub-divisions of government for industrial development purposes, effective as March 15, 1968; and

Whereas Oklahoma is one of the many states which in recent years has enjoyed a respectable industrial growth due very largely to investment funds made possible by such exemption of interest on industrial bonds from Federal income taxes, whose industrial progress is now seriously threatened by such arbitrary action on the part of the Treasury Department; and

Whereas said action is in direct conflict with the expressed policy of the present administration in Washington, to increase jobs and payrolls and reduce the number "hard-core" employable, the accomplishment of which desirable objectives depends in substantial degree upon availability of invest-

ment funds with which to finance new and expanding industries; and

Whereas the aforesaid Treasury Department action will also result in reduced, rather than greater, Federal tax revenues, in that the aggregate of Federal tax revenues to be received, directly or indirectly, from increased payrolls in related economic activity made possible by the prescribed type of industrial bond financing will exceed by the increase in revenue accruing from the tax ability of such interest; and

Whereas, a further effect of such action to be foreseen as private capital is thus forced out of industrial bonds investment, is a much greater dependence upon Federal funds with which to finance industrial projects, with decisions affecting the progress of our cities and towns being made in Washington instead of being made locally; and

Whereas such action by the U.S. Treasury Department in overturning long-standing administrative interpretation of the law, represents an invasion of the power of Congress solely to make such a vital and important decision, and should not be allowed to stand unchallenged, now therefore be it

1. Resolved, That the aforesaid action by the U.S. Treasury Department should be, and it is hereby, deplored and condemned and should be reversed by action of Congress.

2. Resolved, That the effect of such action on the State of Oklahoma, and particularly upon the smaller cities and towns in this State, will be most harmful and injurious, rendering much more difficult our problem of cooperating with the Federal Government in decreasing job opportunities for the unemployed and under employed in this area.

3. That copies of this Resolution be distributed to all Members of Congress of Oklahoma, including the U.S. Senators from Oklahoma, to the President of the United States, his Secretary of the Treasury, and the Officers of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Dated this 13th day of March, 1968, at Oklahoma City, Okla.

GEORGE NIGH,
Chairman.

Attest:

CLARENCE WRIGHT,
Secretary.

IRISH IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday was St. Patrick's Day, an occasion for reflection about the contributions of Americans of Irish descent who helped to build this land. It is appropriate on this occasion to turn our attention to an incidental effect of the 1965 immigration reform legislation, which is closing the doors to many sons of Ireland desiring to immigrate to the United States.

The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act reformed America's immigration policy by ending the arbitrary and unjust national origins quota system and substituting a system of preferences giving priority to the reuniting of families and the admission of immigrants with needed skills.

In the case of Ireland, where most immigrants have been young, without formal training or immediate family al-

ready in the United States, the new preference categories have frozen out many potential Irish immigrants.

One of the most severe obstacles is section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1955 which requires aliens in certain categories to obtain a labor certificate. Before the act was amended, aliens who wished to enter the United States could do so, unless the Secretary of Labor certified that—

(A) There are available in the United States at the alien's proposed destination sufficient workers able, willing, and qualified at the time of application for a visa and for admission to the United States, to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, or (B) the employment of such aliens will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

Under the 1965 changes the burden of proof has been reversed. Instead of providing that an alien can enter unless the Secretary says no, it now says that an alien cannot enter unless the Secretary says yes. Far from being merely a technical change, this provision requires a prospective immigrant to prove that he will not be displacing an American worker. In practice, this is almost impossible.

In addition, section 204(a) requires sixth-preference immigrants—skilled and unskilled workers—to have a definite job before they immigrate. A worker cannot request his own visa; his employer must do it for him. This is an additional obstacle.

Two bills of mine would alleviate the effects of the 1965 act by removing the definite job requirements—H.R. 15350—and by amending section 212(a) (14) to conform to its language prior to the 1965 act—H.R. 7775. My bills would simply mitigate the unanticipated effects of the new law.

Since the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1955, Irish immigration has fallen off sharply. For example, the number of inquiries to the American Embassy, Dublin, regarding immigration to the United States has decreased steadily:

| Inquiries: | |
|------------|-------|
| 1964 | 6,483 |
| 1965 | 5,797 |
| 1966 | 4,725 |
| 1967 | 4,100 |

¹ Estimate; exact figure not available.

Similarly, applicants for immigrant visas have decreased:

| Applicants: | |
|-------------|-------|
| 1964 | 5,817 |
| 1965 | 4,750 |
| 1966 | 1,996 |
| 1967 | 2,026 |

And the number of visas actually issued has also declined:

| Visas issued: | |
|---------------|-------|
| 1964 | 4,619 |
| 1965 | 4,004 |
| 1966 | 1,741 |
| 1967 | 1,809 |

Immigration from Ireland is now running at a rate less than half of what it was in 1964.

A study prepared at my request by the American Embassy in Dublin last April 1967, stated:

There is no doubt that Section 212 (a) (14) of the Act has caused a decrease in Irish immigration to the United States. As many Irish visa applicants are unskilled or semi-skilled workers, they are unable to qualify under Section 212 (a) (14) as amended.

I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 10, page 13167, a study on Irish immigration to the United States. These statistics were brought up to date in a supplementary letter which I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 20, page 27250.

I have received a report from the American Embassy at Dublin bringing the statistics up to the end of 1967. It illustrates a further decrease in Irish immigration to the United States.

I include Ambassador Raymond R. Guest's letter of February 8, 1968, at this point in the RECORD.

DUBLIN, IRELAND,
February 8, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RYAN: I refer to your letter of January 23, 1968, and to our interim reply of January 31, 1968, in regard to bringing up-to-date the statistics concerning Irish immigration furnished you in September 1967.

The statistics which you requested are as follows:

1. Question: All persons who have made an inquiry regarding immigration from Ireland to the United States.

Answer:

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| July 1967 | 329 |
| August 1967 | 373 |
| September 1967 | 328 |
| October 1967 | 347 |
| November 1967 | 288 |
| December 1967 | 184 |

Total 1,849

2. Question: All persons for whom a petition or labor certification has been approved, or who have established their exemption from the provisions of Section 212(a) (14) of Immigration Act of 1955, i.e. applicants for immigrant visas.

Answer:

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| July 1967 | 211 |
| August 1967 | 220 |
| September 1967 | 171 |
| October 1967 | 213 |
| November 1967 | 181 |
| December 1967 | 200 |

Total 1,196

3. Question: The number of immigrant visas issued, and refused to Irish applicants by each preference category, as well as immediate relatives and special immigrants.

Answer: See Table 1 (enclosed).

4. Question: The occupations of applicants to whom immigrant visas were issued under the third, the sixth and the nonpreference categories; by category.

Answer: See Table 2 (enclosed)

5. Question: The number of preliminary visa questionnaires which gave occupations listed in Schedule B of Title 29, Part 60, Section 60.2(a) (2), Subtitle A of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).

Answer:

| | |
|-----------|---|
| July | 1 |
| August | — |
| September | — |
| October | 1 |
| November | 2 |
| December | 1 |

Total 5

It is a pleasure to be of assistance to you in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND R. GUEST,
American Ambassador.

TABLE 1.—IMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AND REFUSED AT DUBLIN TO IRISH APPLICANTS

| Classification | July 1-Dec. 31, 1967 | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| | Issued | Refused |
| Preference and nonpreference | | |
| 1st | 2 | — |
| 2d | 18 | 1 |
| 3d | — | — |
| 4th | — | — |
| 5th | 128 | 29 |
| 6th | — | — |
| Nonpreference | 594 | 57 |
| Total | 742 | 87 |
| Immediate relatives: | | |
| IR-1 | 17 | 3 |
| IR-2 | 13 | 1 |
| IR-3 | — | — |
| IR-4 | 9 | — |
| IR-5 | 13 | — |
| Total | 52 | 4 |
| Special immigrants: | | |
| SA-1 | — | — |
| SA-2 | — | — |
| SA-3 | — | — |
| SB-1 | 35 | 2 |
| SD-1 | 14 | — |
| SD-2 | — | — |
| Total | 49 | 2 |

Note: The majority of applicants, who are shown as having been refused visas, ultimately overcame the grounds of their ineligibility and were issued visas. For instance, an applicant who lacks a police certificate or sufficient evidence of support would be refused a visa. Upon receipt of the required documents, if satisfactory, the applicant would be eligible to receive a visa.

TABLE 2.—OCCUPATIONS OF APPLICANTS ISSUED IMMIGRANT VISAS FROM JULY 1 TO DEC. 31, 1967, TO WHOM SEC. 212(a)(14) IS APPLICABLE

| Occupation | 3d pref- erence | 6th pref- erence | Non- preference |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Domestic | — | — | 181 |
| Nurse | — | — | 67 |
| Nun | — | — | 66 |
| Priest | — | — | 43 |
| Teacher | — | — | 16 |
| Nurses aide | — | — | 1 |
| Children's nurse | — | — | 1 |
| Tutor-governess | — | — | 1 |
| Religious student | — | — | 1 |
| Mechanical engineer | — | — | 8 |
| Civil engineer | — | — | 4 |
| Electronic engineer | — | — | 2 |
| Electrical engineer | — | — | 3 |
| Chemical engineer | — | — | 1 |
| Aeronautical engineer | — | — | 1 |
| Engineer | — | — | 1 |
| Biochemist | — | — | 3 |
| Physiotherapist | — | — | 3 |
| Radiographer | — | — | 1 |
| Medical doctor | — | — | 3 |
| Research scientist | — | — | 2 |
| Research chemist | — | — | 2 |
| Research veterinarian | — | — | 1 |
| Chemist | — | — | 2 |
| University lecturer | — | — | 2 |
| University professor | — | — | 1 |
| Barrister at law | — | — | 1 |
| Chartered accountant | — | — | 1 |
| Sociologist | — | — | 1 |
| Architect | — | — | 1 |
| Draftsman | — | — | 2 |
| Accounting clerk | — | — | 1 |
| Communications assistant | — | — | 1 |
| Secretary | — | — | 11 |
| Shorthand typist | — | — | 5 |
| Typist | — | — | 3 |
| Clerk | — | — | 1 |
| Keypunch operator | — | — | 1 |
| Maintenance foreman | — | — | 1 |
| Factory manager | — | — | 1 |
| Hotel manager, steward | — | — | 1 |
| Assistant creamery manager | — | — | 1 |
| Cabinetmaker | — | — | 3 |
| Motor mechanic | — | — | 1 |
| Driver | — | — | 2 |
| Electrician | — | — | 1 |
| Glazier | — | — | 1 |
| Handyman | — | — | 1 |
| Dipper | — | — | 1 |
| Panel beater | — | — | 1 |
| Knitting machine operator | — | — | 1 |
| Knitter | — | — | 3 |

TABLE 2.—OCCUPATIONS OF APPLICANTS ISSUED IMMIGRANT VISAS FROM JULY 1 TO DEC. 31, 1967, TO WHOM SEC. 212(a)(14) IS APPLICABLE—Continued

| Occupation | 3d pref- erence | 6th pref- erence | Non- preference |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Sewing machinist..... | | | 1 |
| Hairdresser..... | | | 1 |
| Airline stewardess..... | | | 4 |
| Airline instructor..... | | | 1 |
| Airline pilot..... | | | 1 |
| Airline official..... | | | 1 |
| Riding instructor..... | | | 1 |
| Waiter..... | | | 2 |
| Chef..... | | | 2 |
| Butler..... | | | 1 |
| Housekeeper (hotel)..... | | | 1 |
| Professional football coach..... | | | 1 |
| Total..... | | | 482 |

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7775 and 15350 remedy unforeseen defects in the Immigration Nationality Act of 1965 which discriminate particularly against immigrants from Ireland. In this Chamber, it is hardly necessary to dwell on the accomplishments of Americans of Irish descent. I hope we will act on our words of friendship for Ireland and remove the obstacles to those sons of Ireland who wish to immigrate to the United States.

For the further confirmation of my colleagues I include an article on this matter from today's New York Times written by John Corry:

IMMIGRATION SHOWS AN ETHNIC CHANGE
(By John Corry)

The pattern of immigration to the United States is changing, and it is about to change more as increasing numbers of Italians, Greeks, Chinese, Portuguese and Filipinos replace declining number of English, Irish, Dutch and Germans.

The extent of the change has surprised even those who fought hardest for it. Moreover, it will become more pronounced after July 1 when the last traces of the national origins quota system disappear.

This, in turn, has touched off some feeling in Congress that the Immigration laws ought to be amended further. Some ethnic groups in the United States, most notably the American Irish Immigration Committee, are lobbying to see that this is done.

On Saturday, the committee took its case to the people, distributing buttons at the St. Patrick's parade here that said, "Immigration or Die 1968." The words surrounded a big green shamrock.

The national origins quota system, which had determined the pattern of immigration since 1929, sought to preserve the ethnic balance that existed in the United States when the 1920 census was taken.

As a practical matter, this meant that emigrants from Britain and Northern Ireland, Germany and Ireland could make up 70 per cent of the emigrants from the Eastern Hemisphere who were to be admitted to the United States each year.

Asians were virtually excluded from entry, while emigration from Latin America and Canada was allowed to continue without any numerical restriction.

The national origins quota system was revised in October, 1965. The revision provided that, until July 1, 1968, no foreign country would have its quota of potential immigrants to the United States reduced, but that the unused portion of each quota would be assigned to a pool from which potential immigrants from all nations could be drawn.

Britain, for example, annually had between 40,000 and 50,000 unused places in its quota. However, in Italy, which had an annual quota of 5,666 before the law was revised, more than 200,000 people were seeking admission to the United States.

Under the revised law, Britain's unused places, along with those of other countries, were distributed among the emigrants from Italy and of other countries, including the Asian ones, where the demand for United States visas had always surpassed the supply.

The distribution was done under a preference system that gave most of the new visas to relatives of United States residents. A lesser number was distributed on the basis of talents and skills that were needed in the United States.

After July 1, when the national origins quota system passes away, this preference system will govern immigration to the United States almost entirely.

Already, however, the effect of the new system has been dramatic.

The 1965 fiscal year—from July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965—was the last full year under the old rules for immigration. The 1967 fiscal year was the first full year under the revised system.

COMPARISON MADE

Following is a comparison of the 10 leading suppliers of immigrants and the number from each who entered the United States with immigrant visas in both years:

| 1965 | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| Britain and No. Ireland..... | 29,056 |
| Germany..... | 22,899 |
| Poland..... | 6,488 |
| Italy..... | 5,666 |
| Ireland..... | 5,506 |
| Netherlands..... | 2,940 |
| France..... | 2,901 |
| Soviet Union..... | 2,697 |
| Sweden..... | 2,496 |
| Norway..... | 2,363 |

| 1967 | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| Britain and No. Ireland..... | 23,071 |
| Italy..... | 20,000 |
| China..... | 16,505 |
| Portugal..... | 12,137 |
| Greece..... | 11,170 |
| Germany..... | 8,333 |
| Philippines..... | 7,128 |
| Poland..... | 4,451 |
| Yugoslavia..... | 4,218 |
| India..... | 4,143 |

Furthermore, the Visa Office in the State Department says, the new immigration will shift further in the first full year after the national quotas are abolished.

It estimates that the 10 leading countries will look this way in 1969:

| | |
|------------------|--------|
| Italy..... | 20,000 |
| Greece..... | 20,000 |
| Portugal..... | 20,000 |
| China..... | 20,000 |
| Philippines..... | 13,000 |
| India..... | 6,000 |
| Poland..... | 5,000 |
| Yugoslavia..... | 5,000 |
| Germany..... | 3,000 |
| Korea..... | 2,900 |

After July 1, a limit of 120,000 is to be placed on emigrants from the Western Hemisphere, although there will be no limit on the number from any one country. Moreover, the preference system will not apply to Western Hemisphere emigrants.

For Eastern Hemisphere emigrants, however, the preference will be offered on a first-come, first-served basis. That is, if a Taiwanese who has a brother or sister in San Francisco applies for a visa on July 2 he will get it before, say, a Londoner with a brother or sister in New York who applies on July 3.

NO SERIOUS OBJECTIONS

No one in Congress appears to be quarreling seriously with this procedure or with the abolition of the national origins quota systems.

For one thing, a Senate source said, "Congressmen don't want to look like racists." (For another, a Republican Representative

said, the immigration law is too complicated to be easily grasped.)

No one, either, appears to be seriously questioning whether the United States can assimilate a different generation of immigrants. Indeed, the number of immigrants now is relatively small compared with the great days of immigration before World War I.

In the 1967 fiscal year, the total of immigrants from all sources was 361,972, the highest in 43 years, but six times between 1905 and 1914 the number surpassed one million. The smallest number of immigrants in that period was 751,786.

Immigrants represented a much larger percentage of the population. The population in 1910 according to the Bureau of the Census was 91,972,268; today, it is more than 200 million.

Nonetheless, there is agitation that the traditional sources of immigrants, countries with old cultural, political and economic bonds with the United States, are being discriminated against.

For example, the preference system aims at reuniting families that were divided when an earlier generation of emigrants left their homes. However, the traditional emigrant from Northern Europe is not a family man; he crosses the Atlantic alone and founds a family here.

The Southern European pattern is different. Italians, Greeks and Portuguese cross with wives and children and send home for parents, brothers and sisters. The preference system favors them.

Moreover, the preference system into which a traditional Northern European might fit—that of immigrants who will perform skilled or unskilled labor—is one of the smallest, with room for no more than 17,000 persons. It also is tightly circumscribed by Federal regulations aimed at protecting the native American labor force.

POLICY IS PROTECTED

Consequently, a young Irishman, say, who might have immigrated to the United States to find work as a bartender, laborer or cook's helper, is now barred from entry because there is a surfeit here of bartenders, laborers and cooks' helpers.

This has led groups such as the American Irish Immigration Society to protest.

"The Irish can never stand satisfied until the disgraceful blot of the present United States immigration policy is erased," says John P. Collins, the president of the society.

U.S. VETERANS ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission has submitted its report to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs. I want to congratulate and thank the members of the Commission for a report which will no doubt become the basis for future legislation concerning veterans' benefits.

From the report of the citizens of this country can easily assess the hard work and long hours of study that went into the compiling of such a document. The veterans of this country will appreciate this comprehensive review of every present program and the evaluation of proposals for needed improvements and new

legislation recommended by the many who testified in the hearings.

This report is a compliment to those who have served this Nation in the Armed Forces. Instigated at the request of the President, the Commission has produced a document that will no doubt become the cornerstone of all future legislation enacted, or revisions to present legislation. On the basis of the report, the administration and Congress will have a firsthand review available detailing the actual problems and needs of our veterans. At the same time the proposals assure that—as the President asked—the American taxpayer is getting his money's worth in the veterans' benefit programs.

I compliment the members of the Commission for a job well done. I believe that this study and its recommendations are by far the most equitable ever presented. When we discuss veterans' benefits all programs must look to the future. This report looks far into the future and makes proposals that can be adjusted to the changes in our social and economic structures.

I appreciate the fact that this report does not mince words or become ambiguous. It deals straightforwardly with the problems, and makes suggestions. I am sure that, using the report as a basis, we will be able to fulfill our obligation to our veterans and their dependents.

I thank the Commission for their devotion to the task they were asked to perform. I believe they deserve the highest praise for their great accomplishment.

IMPACT AID

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House conferees appointed yesterday will endorse the wise decision of the other body to add \$90,965,000 for the impacted school aid program to H.R. 15399, the urgent supplemental appropriations bill.

The Senate amendment would permit the Office of Education to fully fund the impact aid entitlements of some 4,200 school districts. Without this extra money, payments will fall about 20 percent short. In fairness to these school systems, many of which have based long-range plans on the assumption that full entitlements would be forthcoming, we really have no choice other than to accept the amendment.

Many of us have been hearing about the impending shortage from the school administrators back home.

As a Congressman for the most heavily impacted school system in the Nation—the San Diego Unified School District—I am acutely aware of the urgency behind the appeals from these school superintendents.

San Diego City Schools expected to receive about \$6 million under Public Law 874 this year. Without the additional appropriations voted by the other body, the system will lose \$1.2 million of its allocation.

Where will the cuts be made, if we fail to provide this money?

In San Diego, I am advised, there would have to be some reduction of maintenance and other support services. Eventually the local taxpayers, already burdened with one of the country's higher property rates, would have to make up the deficit by remitting another 12 cents for every \$100 of assessed valuation. San Diegans today are paying \$4.04 per \$100 for their schools.

Some 27,000 students now enrolled in San Diego's schools have parents who live or work on tax-exempt Federal installations. San Diegans have demonstrated a willingness to do their share to support our national defense effort and many other Federal activities.

Congress should respond by providing more equitable compensation for the school systems in all the areas that are assisting the National Government, at a great expense in lost tax revenues, in this time of crisis.

FULL SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, our hopes that last year's reorganization of the District of Columbia Government would bring the citizens of the District closer to their governing body have materialized.

However, it is only a limited move; for the denial of full sovereignty for District citizens remains a blot on the most basic principles of a free democracy that we in the United States are ready to proudly proclaim. Fortunately, we do see some sign of hope in the fact that the Rules Committee presently has before it a proposed constitutional amendment which would give the citizens of the District voting representation in Congress.

As one measure of the broad support for this legislation, the AFL-CIO, at its recent convention, renewed the call for full suffrage in the District of Columbia, and made a solid pledge to help in every way possible to achieve it at the earliest possible date. With unanimous consent, I now offer the federation's resolution, to be reprinted, as follows, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION NO. 115—FULL SUFFRAGE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas, Citizens and Union members of Washington, D.C. have for many decades advocated full suffrage for the District of Columbia, and

Whereas, The Congress of the United States has passed a constitutional amendment which has been ratified by the states granting the right to vote for President and Vice President to the citizens of the District of Columbia, and

Whereas, The Prospects for home rule and national representation are brighter now than for many years; therefore, be it

Resolved: That all segments of the AFL-CIO be urged to assist the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO in

securing the passage of legislation to achieve these objectives.

RESOLUTION TO SIGNIFY CONGRESSIONAL AWARENESS OF THE URBAN CRISIS

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a House resolution to change the name of the Committee on Banking and Currency from its present designation to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. In proposing a change in name I in no way propose that the current jurisdiction of the committee be expanded or shifted, nor that the present involvement in the field of urban affairs by any other House committee be contracted or withdrawn.

My proposal is based in large measure upon the recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. But, recent events also underscore the fact that the press and public are not aware of the scope of the activities of the Committee on Banking and Currency, nor that our involvement in the problems of the urban crisis is based upon a great understanding and expertise in this area. A change in name would be fitting not only in terms of the nature of our concerns, but also in terms of letting the public know that the Congress has a standing committee which has as one of its principal duties a continuing interest in the existing and emerging problems of our cities and metropolitan areas.

The report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was cognizant of this fact. The reasoning for the recommendation was:

The phenomenal growth of urban areas, the enormous problems of this growth has spawned, and the current and probable future expansion of Federal programs to deal with these problems, signified in part by the creation of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, point to the need for specialized congressional recognition of this increasingly significant area of public policy. The present concern of the Banking and Currency Committees in each House with housing problems, coupled with the membership and staff expertise in this general area, make these committees the logical instruments for the evaluation of proposals dealing with new matters affecting urban areas. The Joint Committee does not feel, particularly in view of the relatively light workload of these committees as they now exist as well as their expertise in the area of housing, that a separate urban affairs committee in each House is justified.

The statement of the joint committee certainly summarizes my own thoughts. Their view is based upon 17 months of intensive study into the organization and operation of the Congress. I should elaborate, however, for my concurrence with their proposal is based upon 18 years of service with the Banking and Currency Committee, the last 6 as ranking minority member of both the full committee and the Special Subcommittee on Housing, a period in which the committee has

grown in stature, specialization, and understanding in the complex field of housing and urban development.

The Banking and Currency Committee was established in 1865. Its initial mandate gave it jurisdiction over all propositions relating to banking and currency. However, its activities were somewhat limited during the first 50 years of its existence because the work of overseeing the monetary policies of the Nation was exercised by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. During the Wilson administration the committee began to play a far more active role in the legislative review of banking practices in the Nation, its active role in the field of banking culminating with the absorption of that jurisdiction of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures dealing with all monetary matters following the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The committee's involvement in the field of housing began in 1937. The referral of the public housing legislation to the Banking and Currency Committee was based upon the natural link of money and credit with the building and purchasing of homes. The same essential interlocking between urban development and the mortgage financing market has, since the start of this decade, led the committee into the broader area where our concern is not limited to units of housing alone, but with the quality of the human environment. In fact, our committee is the parent committee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with legislative review of nearly every program administered by HUD.

The Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization took note of this development to some extent in its report entitled "Federal Role in Urban Affairs." The Senate report stated that since 1961 both the Congress and the executive branch have responded to the urgent needs of the Nation by "devising new and sweeping programs which, for the first time, place the Federal Government in a position to mount an attack on our urban problems on a broad enough front to be commensurate with the ramifications of the entrenched problems themselves."

In the vanguard of this movement has been the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

It is to the Banking and Currency Committee that the House has looked for creative legislation in college, elderly housing, low-rent public housing, urban renewal, community development, urban mass transportation, urban planning, open spaces, and water and sewer programs as well as the mortgage and credit devices necessary to spur the development of both nonprofit and commercial housing. Our efforts have grown from providing public housing for the indigent to a full-scale attack on urban blight through the Demonstration Cities Act which couples programs to overcome educational disadvantages, disease, and enforced idleness with efforts to improve substantially the housing, highways, and sanitation systems that exist in the inner city.

Mr. Speaker, 13 proposals in the 89th Congress and an additional 28 in this Congress to establish a separate committee on urban affairs indicates that not even Members of the House are aware of either the extent of the involvement of the Committee on Banking and Currency in this area or the depth of its expertise. This proposal to change the name of the committee to more properly identify its function would go a long way toward rectifying this problem. More importantly, to my mind, is the fact that we, the Congress, would be publicly informing the Nation of our far-reaching concern for the problems of the cities and our continuing determination to remedy them with constructive legislation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, March 20; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ZWACH, for 30 minutes, on March 20.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. BATTIN.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. COLLIER in four instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. BUTTON.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.

Mr. DENNEY.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. TAFT in four instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REUSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POOL.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in four instances.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. DONOHUE in three instances.

Mr. LENNON.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. RESNICK.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. CASEY in two instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. WHITENER in three instances.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 793. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission;

S. 876. An act relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; and

S. 2336. An act to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituted tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on March 18, 1968, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14743. An act to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1660. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on the agricultural conservation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, pursuant

to the provisions of 50 Stat. 329; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1661. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "District of Columbia Gun Control Act of 1968"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1662. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low and moderate income persons and families in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1663. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1664. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors in the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1665. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of female employees in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1666. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit landlords from retaliating against tenants for good faith complaints of housing violations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1667. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1668. A letter from the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1669. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need to increase effectiveness of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program for aiding students and unemployed youths in Cleveland, Ohio, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1670. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of omission of facilities for metering electricity in individual housing units proposed to reduce construction costs of low-rent public housing projects, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1671. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to conflicts of interest, with respect to the members of the District of Columbia Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1672. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer, conveyance, lease, and improvement of, and construction on, certain property in the District of Columbia, for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for gov-

ernments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1180. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 15856. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1103. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4282, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain requirements with respect to effectuating marketing orders for cherries (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1104. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10477, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the amount of home loan guarantee entitlement from \$7,500 to \$10,000, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1105. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10790, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the protection of the public health from radiation emissions from electronic products (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1106. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2029, an act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 relating to the application of certain standards to motor vehicles produced in quantities of less than 500 (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16044. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize certain grants for assisting in improved operation of waste treatment plants; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 16045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 16046. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to help secure safe community water supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16047. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by increasing the penalties for illegal manufacture and

traffic in hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs, including possession of such drugs for sale or other disposal to another, and by making it a misdemeanor to possess any such drug for one's own use except when prescribed or furnished by a licensed practitioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 16048. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16049. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax automobiles sold to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 16050. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to make provision for specialized facilities for alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 16051. A bill to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 16052. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased assistance for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16053. A bill to amend section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to provide increased rent supplement payments in the case of tenants with larger families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 16054. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 16055. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 16056. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 16057. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirements for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 16058. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 16059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the 3- and 1-percent floors, of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 16060. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRAY, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa):

H.R. 16061. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 to provide for the office of Poet Laureate of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 16062. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 16063. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to continue the existing status of interest on industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. REES, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. FINO, and Mr. WYLLIE):

H.R. 16064. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to the scope of the audit by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHERLE (for himself and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 16065. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in deeds conveying certain lands to the State of Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. RARICK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. McCLOREY, and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 16066. A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold in the event of the removal of the requirement that gold reserves be held against currency in circulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 16067. A bill to amend the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the application of the public information and disclosure provisions of such chapter; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 16068. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 1176. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1177. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.J. Res. 1179. Joint resolution to provide for the exclusion from gross income, under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, of interest on industrial development bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 1180. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year

as "National Fire Service Recognition Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.J. Res. 1181. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in May of each year as "National Fire Service Recognition Day," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.J. Res. 1182. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 1183. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 1184. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.J. Res. 1185. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 1186. Joint resolution to authorize a study and investigation of information service systems for States and localities designed to enable such States and localities to participate more effectively in federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 1187. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 714. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 715. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 716. Concurrent resolution relative to Citizens Radio Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 717. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. Con. Res. 718. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZION:

H. Con. Res. 719. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 720. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 721. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. MacGREGOR):

H. Con. Res. 722. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to investigate the plight of the victims of the Sicilian earthquakes and, if necessary, direct the Attorney General to take appropriate action under the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 723. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take action to insure the United States will derive maximum benefits from an expanded and intensified effort to increase the accuracy and extend the time range of weather predictions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 1107. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to change the name of the Committee on Banking and Currency to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 16069. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jan Pawelczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 16070. A bill for the relief of Tove Belstrup Nielsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 16071. A bill for the relief of Miss Sofia Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16072. A bill for the relief of Josef Arsoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 16073. A bill for the relief of Antonietta Maria Calone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16074. A bill for the relief of Franco Geralmo Giraudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 16075. A bill for the relief of Francesco Paolo Fiordimondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 16076. A bill for the relief of John P. Skjold, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 16077. A bill authorizing the payment of retired pay to Lawrence E. Ellis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 16078. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mateus dos Santos-Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 16079. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Domenico Marino and their children, Ciriaco, Adelaide, Gaetano, Elvira, Gerardo, and Carmine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 16080. A bill for the relief of Antonio

and Adelina Pirozzolo and their two children, Marino and Marco Pirozzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POCELL:

H.R. 16081. A bill for the relief of Cosima Bellucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 16082. A bill for the relief of Maria del

Carmen Marciano-Soltero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 16083. A bill for the relief of Carmela Toschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 16084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophia Takacs and Sophia Kondor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

265. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the National Farmers Union, Washington, D.C., relative to the civil rights bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American Involvement in Vietnam

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several weeks ago I had the privilege of seeing a film by David Schoenbrun, former CBS correspondent, entitled "Vietnam: How Did We Get In; How Can We Get Out?" That film is a human document of American involvement in Vietnam. It presents a well-reasoned program for peace by a man who has known North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh for 21 years, who was the only American journalist to witness the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu, and who recently returned from a 6-week trip to Hanoi.

David Schoenbrun calls for American extrication from Vietnam. Yet he is neither traitor nor pacifist. He is one of those rare men who have witnessed history in the making, who have known the men who moved history, and who have recorded it all with freedom and objectivity.

Schoenbrun's demand for a new Vietnam policy is anything but a radical denial of God and country. It is an assertion that this is a great Nation led momentarily off course; it is a call to set a Nation straight.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Schoenbrun film be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. When I say that I'm pleased to be in San Francisco, I really mean it. It's a great pleasure. It may also be the last pleasurable thing that I will say to you today, for there is nothing pleasurable in discussing Vietnam.

I'd like to address myself with you to the questions that all Americans are asking, and to invite you to walk down the paths of history with me, for I have lived the answers to these questions in twenty-one years of my life.

Let's begin with the first question: How did we get into it in the first place? For me, this question began many, many years ago, when I was a young intelligence officer on the Staff of General Eisenhower. And in going through our intelligence reports, I saw that some colleagues of mine, Colonel Gallagher, Major Patti, and others, had been sent to a country named Vietnam about which I knew almost nothing. They had been sent to the north of that country to make contact with a great patriot who was fighting for the independence of his country, fighting against the Japanese, a man who was our ally in this great world struggle. I'll give you one guess—and one, only—of the name of this great patriot now. Yes, that's right—Ho Chi Minh.

Ho Chi Minh, the patriotic ally of the United States, today is a villain and our enemy. What has happened in two decades to change him from a patriot and ally to a villain and an enemy? In what way has he changed? Well, I have known Ho Chi Minh for twenty years—twenty-one years, exactly—from the first day I met him in June of 1946 to the last time I met him in August, 1967, just a few weeks ago. I must tell you that Ho Chi Minh has not changed. He is today what he was then, a dedicated Communist revolutionary. He was fighting for the independence of his country against the French colonial empire and against the Japanese invaders. He is still fighting for the independence of his country. He wants it to be a free country. He also wants it to be a Communist country. We knew that when we were allied with him.

So what, in fact, has changed? We have changed. Twenty-five years ago we were allied with the Communists—we were allies with the Soviet Union in the war against the forces of darkness of Hitler and of Tojo. We were also true to our most cherished traditions of anti-colonialism. We are the world's greatest anti-colonial power, or used to be. We threw off the yoke of tyranny—from Britain. We have always dedicated ourselves to freedom for subject people. That's one reason why we supported Ho Chi Minh, and many other peoples around the world who, in the wake of World War II's destruction of the old European colonial empires, were seeking freedom and independence. And we, under a great President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—were dedicated to those goals. I was proud to be an American soldier fighting under the flag of the four freedoms, as well as our own beloved flag, the Stars and Stripes. I was proud to be a member of the country whose President said that we were not fighting the war to restore the colonial empires of France, Britain, Holland, Portugal but fighting for freedom.

I remember what other people's reactions were. What a wonderful feeling to be an American in those days! People's eyes would light up. Our country was the inspiration and the aspiration of all people. And it was grand to be an American to see people standing up and hoping for freedom. That's what Ho Chi Minh stood up for. That's what Ho Chi Minh hoped for. And that's what we were helping him to do until President Roosevelt died. Then the war ended and the allied coalition died too. The Cold War with the Soviet Union began. I supported the Truman Doctrine; I supported the Marshall Plan; I supported our entering the war in Korea. I tell you this because I want you to know that I am not a dove, and I hate the word dove, or hawk, or eagle, or owl, or any other of the creatures of the aviary of American politics. I'm a human being; I'm a man; my name is David Schoenbrun, and I am opposed to this war because it is cruel and unjust and immoral, and cannot be won. And I have reached that conclusion, not because I'm a dove, but because I'm a man, and I've got brains, and I'm a free man. And I've watched it, and studied it, and participated in it. I am covered with wounds from war; I have covered wars for a long time. Some wars are just, and I will fight; some wars are unjust, and I will fight against them. That's why I'm doing this today. I want you to know

there's no pleasure or privilege or profit in standing up and fighting the government this way. This is my duty as an American citizen to do. And, thank God, I still live in a country where it's possible to do so. The government isn't very happy about it, but there's nothing it can do to halt dissent.

Mr. Johnson admits that dissent is a tradition and basic right of our country. Of course, what he really says is, "I'm in favor of dissent, just so long as you don't criticize me." But he's going to have to stand still for the criticism. As we review the record of how we got in, it's a sorry record.

Ho Chi Minh, fired up by the talk of the four freedoms, determined to free his country, came out of the underground when the Japanese surrendered in August 1945. He went to Hanoi with his people and he proclaimed the Republic of Vietnam. And he read to them the Constitution, which he drafted in the underground, while fighting the Japanese. It began with these words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident." He translated the American Declaration of Independence and offered it to his country.

There were people who said then, and people who would say, "Oh, that's a cunning Communist play, a play for American sympathy." All right. Maybe it was. But what an inspiring play! Isn't it nice that someone should seek American sympathy by translating our Declaration of Independence? Anybody who wants to be cunning by translating our own beloved birth certificate, be my guest, because that's the kind of cunning that I like. Ho offered this document to his people; his people acclaimed him. And he became the President of Vietnam. And the French, who were too weakened by war to reconquer their colonies had nothing to do but accept it. Oh, they had mental reservations, and they were plotting to reconquer Indochina, but, in the winter 1945-1946 there was nothing they could do but accept the reality that Ho Chi Minh was the leader of his people. And this is important. They signed a convention with him, on March 6, 1946, recognizing Viet Nam to be "a free State."

Remember the date and the event when you discuss this war in Vietnam.

Americans are decent people, and Americans want to do what's right. I am sure the great majority of our citizens do not want to play a power political game unless justice is on our side. But justice is not on our side, and the facts will show it.

They signed the convention on the 6th of March, 1946, recognized Ho Chi Minh as President of Vietnam; this was accepted by the United States of America. At the same time, the Emperor of Indo-China, Bao Dai, abdicated his throne; took his birth name, citizen Vinh Thuy, became political counsel under Ho Chi Minh. So Ho had the recognition of France and he had the legitimacy of the dynasty. Nobody challenged his right to be President of Vietnam; not North Vietnam, or South Vietnam, but Vietnam, the one country shaped like an hour-glass that runs from the Chinese mountains down to the Gulf of Siam. One people, one language, one culture with aspirations for unity that they have fought for two thousand years. No other man has ever been elected and recognized as the President of Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh is the only legitimate leader of his country. I'm not his advocate. I regret the fact he is a Communist.